

957

FARTHER
THOUGHTS
CONCERNING
Human Soul,

In Defence of
Second Thoughts,

WHEREIN
The weak Efforts of the Reverend
Mr. Turner, and other less significant
Writers are occasionally Answer'd.

*I bear them Record that they have a
Zeal, but not according to Knowledge,
Rom. 10. 2.*

By the Author of *Second Thoughts*.

L O N D O N,

Printed for Richard Bassett at the Mitre over against
Chancery-Lane-End in Fleet-street; Where *Second
Thoughts* are to be had, 1703.

THE
MUSEUM
BRITAN
NICVM

62f

THE
Epistle Dedicatory
TO THE
Prejudic'd Zealot.

Opinions which have never been commonly receiv'd, like a New Garment, sit very stiff, and uneasy on us at first, and as it were Cramp our Understanding to bring it to a Compliance or Conviction. And if we do give our consent to the whole Truth, or but part of such Novelties, as they are presently call'd, it is done with so great Reluctancy and Regret, that a Man is apt to interpret it to be the same thing as calling himself Fool, if he give a ready Belief to the Proofs brought, or disbelieve upon no other principles but those of Education or Prejudice. But if Time and Deliberate
A 2 Reason

The Epistle Dedicatory

Reason happen to wear out such Principles, what at first seem'd extremely difficult becomes Easy and Familiar, and that which once gave the Ground, or Foundation of such a Question, why should we believe such Novelties, becomes now the Parent of another, why should we disbelieve them? Such strange varieties and turns happen in Men's Judgments, which their understanding is set free from the clogs of Prejudice and Education, especially if Illiterate, and not cultivated with Learning. But seeing those Tares still grow up with the good Principles which a free and unbiass'd Reason sows in our Natures, I cannot but expect from you at the very first entrance a Question parallel to this, if not the same: What! another Book against the Immortality of the Soul? Sure too much Learning has made you mad, or too little, a Fool. Such is the Language of a Prejudic'd Reader, inflam'd by an unreasonable Zeal, which methinks is wanted like the Passion of a Stammerer, more seemingly design'd to spit in ones Face, than to be uttered, as words of Discretion. And indeed how is it possible that Prejudice and Discretion should go together, or that a Zeal
grounded

To the Prejudic'd Zealot.

grounded on an old receiv'd Fundamental of Religion, should not be intemperate, if that Fundamental be question'd as Erroneous; Especially amongst the Ignorant and Illiterate, whose Understanding as Estibius observes, is in their Eyes and Tongue, and not in their Brains. But if such Men were told, as they ought to be, if the Ring-leaders of such a popular Cry would do Estibius Justice, that such a Charge against him is nothing but invidious Railery, fit for those to exert who are not able by arguments of Reason to confute Him; that the principal intent, and design of the Author relates not to the Soul's Immortality, but its Substantiality, i. e. whether it be an Immaterial Substance, as Heathen Philosophers have told us, which Doctrine he conceives inconsistent with the true principles of Christianity; perhaps their exorbitant Passions against Estibius might abate, cool, and relent, and even those Incendiaries be reduc'd to a better Temper. For if the Debate were about the Immortality of the Soul, and He denies it to be a Substance, What necessary connexion is there between Immortality and Substance? A thing may be Immortal and not a Substance,

A 3

The Epistle Dedicatory

Reason happen to wear out such Principles, what at first seem'd extremely difficult becomes Easy and Familiar, and that which once gave the Ground, or Foundation of such a Question, why should we believe such Novelties, becomes now the Parent of another, why should we disbelieve them? Such strange varieties and turns happen in Men's Judgments, which their understanding is set free from the clogs of Prejudice and Education, especially if Illiterate, and not cultivated with Learning. But seeing those Tares still grow up with the good Principles which a free and unbiass'd Reason sows in our Natures, I cannot but expect from you at the very first entrance a Question parallel to this, if not the same: What! another Book against the Immortality of the Soul? Sure too much Learning has made you mad, or too little, a Fool. Such is the Language of a Prejudic'd Reader, inflam'd by an unreasonable Zeal, which methinks is vented like the Passion of a Stammerer, more seemingly design'd to spit in ones Face, than to be uttered, as words of Discretion. And indeed how is it possible that Prejudice and Discretion should go together, or that a Zeal grounded

To the Prejudic'd Zealot.

grounded on an old receiv'd Fundamental of Religion, should not be intemperate, if that Fundamental be question'd as Erroneous; Especially amongst the Ignorant and Illiterate, whose Understanding as Estibius observes, is in their Eyes and Tongue, and not in their Brains. But if such Men were told, as they ought to be, if the Ring-leaders of such a popular Cry would do Estibius Justice, that such a Charge against him is nothing but invidious Railery, fit for those to exert who are not able by arguments of Reason to confute Him; that the principal intent, and design of the Author relates not to the Soul's Immortality, but its Substantiality, i. e. whether it be an Immaterial Substance, as Heathen Philosophers have told us, which Doctrine he conceives inconsistent with the true principles of Christianity; perhaps their exorbitant Passions against Estibius might abate, cool, and relent, and even those Incendiaries be reduc'd to a better Temper. For if the Debate were about the Immortality of the Soul, and He denies it to be a Substance, What necessary connexion is there between Immortality and Substance? A thing may be Immortal and not a Sub-

A 3

stance,

The Epistle Dedicatory

stance, and it may be a Substance and not Immortal; as are the Essences and Proprieties of Beings. For if the Essences of things were Substances, there must be a production of such Substances in infinitum, because every Substance must be also suppos'd to have a Substance for its Essence, v. g. If Penetrability be essential to the Nature of an Angel, why must we call it, or necessarily suppose it a Substance united to that Angelical Nature? Nay if God had made the Heavens of an Eternal Duration, (as some Philosophers suppos'd) and the Sun in the midst of the Firmament perpetually circulating in all appearance, and rolling as it were around the Globe of the Earth, What could induce us to call that Motion a Substance, tho' it were Eternal? All we can say is, That where Beings are of an undoubted Eternal Duration, their Properties are also Eternal too, as depending on, and flowing from their Substantial Existence, which will be the same to us in Life, when God shall be pleased to cloath our Mortal Bodies with Immortality. But then this no wise infers, that we must have in us a Spiritual Substance, the immediate subject and cause of that Life, and no other, or that That Life

To the Prejudic'd Zealot.

Life is a Substance; nay tho' it had been the Life of Adam in a state of Innocence, whom all allow would with his Material Body have been Immortal, had he not forfeited that Immortality by Transgression.

Let us therefore lay aside this Substantial ingredient of Man's composition, seeing by Life thorough the Merits of Christ, who came to abolish Death, and bring Life and Immortality to light through the Gospel, 2 Tim. ch. I. v. 10. We shall be as much Immortal, as by any Immaterial Substance whatever you can devise, or imagine. Neither doth it in the least derogate from the Excellency of our Nature, for what can be greater than to bear the Image of God, viz. Life, with all those Rational perfections consequent to it. And what can add a greater perfection to us than to bear the said Image Eternally? i. e. Be like God in Immortality, with more eminent perfections than we now enjoy, whereas Life, as it is now, is but a faint and weak resemblance of that Immortal Life, Adam should have enjoy'd (had he not sinned) whereby he is said to be made in the Image of God, Gen. I. 26. But if we cannot conceive (though the Power of an Omnipotent

The Epistle Dedicatory

tent Creator interpose) how Man can be Immortal without the assistance of an Immaterial or Spiritual Substance united to, and invigorating his Body, let us empty and divest our selves of common Reason, (as indeed we ought to do, when once we question an Almighty Power) and believe all you say with an Implicit Faith, and as we cry down Popery in other points, in this set on work the secret springs of Papal Authority, and make blind Obedience (as some perhaps would have us) the necessary Qualification of a true Member of the Church of England. But God forbid things should ever be brought to that pass, notwithstanding the too passionate Zeal of some unreasonable Men.

We usually blame the Papists for Idolatry in worshipping the Consecrated Host, and the Reason commonly assigned is, because, they cannot prove our Saviour to be really and bodily present in the Sacramental Bread. For if that point was undeniably prov'd, I suppose even we without the Crime of Idolatry might joyn in the same Adoration. Now when Estius comes to dispute the Philosophical Notion of Human Soul, viz. Whether it be an Immaterial Substance, or only Life,

To the Prejudic'd Zealot.

Life, such a popular Noise, and such a Pulpit-rattle, presently resounds in the World, as if he had endeavour'd to unhinge the whole Universe of Religion, and set up Atheism triumphant, when as it is only a true and just Zeal without the exorbitance of Passion, to defend the Principles of our Christian Faith, and not to suffer them to be built on the Foundation of Heathen Philosophers, that moves Estibius to undertake this Controversie; and the reason of this clamour against him seems to be founded on nothing but Prejudice, by which some Men are resolved to own their disbelief of his Principles, because the parallel case of the Papists, before mention'd, comes too home to them. Upon these Grounds, they zealously espouse that Sovereign Maxim of a Bigot, Calumniari fortiter ut aliquid hæreat, to throw dirt thick enough, that some may stick; and this you do specially, and in a singular manner, when Estibius requires you to prove, as you do the Papists, the first Principle, viz. the Existence of that Immaterial Substance, before you attribute Immortality to it. —

But above all, there are one sort of Prejudic'd Zealots, which augment the popular

The Epistle Dedicatory

popular Cry against Estibius, not for his Doctrine's sake, but they hate the Man, either for his pretence to a share of Learning above many of the Common Rank, or for his Church-principles. These are a kind of a mongrel Church-breed, who feed plentifully on the Revenues thereof, but still retain in them the rancour and venom of Fanaticism which they imbib'd perhaps from Education, or a temporizing Patron. These Men Toil and Row in Religion (pardon the Expression) look one way as if they intended all Godliness, but generally Act another way for great Gain. These are Christians in Masquerade, and Socinians preaching up that God-head in Publick, which in private they deride, who under the cloak of Religion undermine our Common Peace, and become the very Hornets of all Civil Societies, only to make their own party uppermost. Such mighty Patriots of Religion, and secret underminers of our Civil Peace, have shew'd themselves frequently most inveterate against Estibius, who hopes they will never beleaguer him with their feigned Friendship, least he unawares touch Pitch and be defiled therewith, and their Hypocrisie grow as
Con-

To the Prejudic'd Zealot:

*Contagious, as their Malice is Inveterate.
Or as Jacob said to Simeon and Levi,
O my Soul, come not thou into their
Secrets, unto their Assembly, mine
Honour, be not thou united. For cur-
sed be their Anger, for it is Fierce, and
their Wrath it is Cruel, Gen. 49. v.
6, 7.*

*Another sort of Angry Zealots I find,
who make it their Business to prejudice
themselves against Estibius upon trust from
others, even contrary sometimes to their
own Inclinations. They would willingly
read the Book, call'd Second Thoughts
concerning Human Soul, but the Spi-
ritual Guide lays an Injunction not to
touch it for fear of being tainted with
Heretical Principles, or ensnared by a
Sophism, and so desert their first Princi-
ples of Education, which he by his preach-
ing has very frequently confirm'd. Hence
is propagated a Spawn of Numerous Ig-
norant Zealots, who right or wrong de-
cry whatever He doth disapprove as He-
terodox, though upon mature deliberation
it may appear most consonant to the Prin-
ciples of Religion. Such Prejudic'd Ze-
lots, Ignorantia habet excusatos, their
Ignorance excuses, and notwithstanding
such*

The Epistle Dedicatory

such sinister ways of exciting the publick Envy against Eslibius, these Guides of Conscience practise contrary to moral Honesty and Christianity, he will endeavour rather to forget, than retaliate, if not carried on with too great a violence of temper, else as Horace says,

Virtute sua se involvet & illum,
Nemo impune laeset.

This I say, because it is a misfortune, not a fault to be Ignorant in many Cases, and I find it next to an Impossibility to convince an Ignorant Zealot. But again, when I find Men of good Sense and great Learning, and Understanding so tenacious of this old Philosophical Notion of an Immaterial Substance (call'd Soul) united to Human Body, without giving me such Arguments as might reasonably be expected for Justification of the truth of their Opinion. It not only moves my Passion a little, but puts me upon thinking whether I am in the right or no? What Reason I have to think so well of my self? As to imagine I have plainly prov'd, all I pretend to prove, seeing the Judgments of Men more learn-
ed

To the Prejudic'd Zealot.

ed far than I know and own my self to be a contrary to mine. These considerations, I say, startle me sometimes, but then, when I again reflect what force and violence I must put upon my Will, to declare contrary to the assent of my Understanding, that I disbelieve so many evident Truths drawn from the Principles of Philosophy, Reason, and Religion, to contradict either directly, or by consequence the several Articles of Christianity, the Scales are immediately turned, and those specious stumbling blocks, I just now mention'd, are easily remov'd, and whatever Arguments for the contrary are thrown into the Balance, are found too light to Byass me as yet into a Retraction of my Opinion. For altho' some Texts in Scripture seem very favourable to prove the Soul of a Man a Substance, if literally taken, as there do for Christ's real presence in the Sacrament; yet because they are so few, and those also not unquestionably evident in their Signification. And whereas on the other hand so many Absurd, and Irreligious, if not Atheistical Consequences follow that Opinion of an Immaterial Substance united to Man, &c. I think it safest and best

The Epistle Dedicatory

such sinister ways of exciting the publick Envy against Eschius, these Guides of Conscience practise contrary to moral Honesty and Christianity, he will endeavour rather to forget, than retaliate, if not carried on with too great a violence of temper, else as Horace says,

Virtute sua se involvet & illum,
Nemo impune laceret.

This I say, because it is a misfortune, not a fault to be ignorant in many Cases, and I find it next to an Impossibility to convince an Ignorant Zealot. But again, when I find Men of good Sense and great Learning, and Understanding so tenacious of this old Philosophical Notion of an Immaterial Substance (call'd Soul) united to Human Body, without giving me such Arguments as might reasonably be expected for Justification of the truth of their Opinion. It not only moves my Passion a little, but puts me upon thinking whether I am in the right or no? What Reason I have to think so well of my self? As to imagine I have plainly prov'd, all I pretend to prove, seeing the Judgments of Men more learn-
ed

To the Prejudic'd Zealot.

ed far than I know and own my self to be a recontrary to mine. These considerations, I say, startle me sometimes, but then, when I again reflect what force and violence I must put upon my Will, to declare contrary to the assent of my Understanding, that I disbelieve so many evident Truths drawn from the Principles of Philosophy, Reason, and Religion, to contradict either directly, or by consequence the several Articles of Christianity, the Scales are immediately turned, and those specious stumbling blocks, I just now mention'd, are easily remov'd, and whatever Arguments for the contrary are thrown into the Balance, are found too light to Byass me as yet into a Retraction of my Opinion. For altho' some Texts in Scripture seem very favourable to prove the Soul of a Man a Substance, if literally taken, as there do for Christ's real presence in the Sacrament; yet because they are so few, and those also not unquestionably evident in their Signification. And whereas on the other hand so many Absurd, and Irreligious, if not Atheistical Consequences follow that Opinion of an Immaterial Substance united to Man, &c. I think it safest and best

The Epistle Dedicatory

best to Err on the right hand, if I am in an Error, and choose that Opinion which seems most consonant to Philosophy, Reason and Christianity.

Now, Mr. Turner, give me leave to apply my self to you: 'Tis a Maxim amongst the Politicians, That a preventing Law is more beneficial to the Publick, than a Punitive of the Crime, v. g. If a Law be Enacted that the Fortune of any Person married by force and compulsion were made alienable even after such Marriage by the Person so compell'd, unless a consummation of the said Marriage were declar'd before a proper Authority by the free and voluntary consent of the Person married by force; no man would ever be hang'd for stealing a Wife, unless they should hang themselves, that she prov'd to have no Fortune at all. Thus if this Opinion be an Heretical One, confute it by proper means, by sober and judicious Arguments, and not by Railery and Scurrility, which will never prevent its Growth. And because you load Estibius sometimes with many severe Questions, give me leave to put a few to you: Do you think it an infringement of your
Pte.

To the Prejudic'd Zealot.

Prerogative, that a Physician should search into the Grounds of Religion, and his Faith? I cannot forbear telling you that the little study of Divinity I have lately applied my self to, is the Pleasure, and Delight of my declining Tears, and I launch out, as it were, into an immense satisfaction that I find something even beyond my Reason to terminate my daily Inquisition, viz. Faith, which makes other Sciences appear but Delicatula nugandi artes, a pleasant way of trifling, and when you have search'd as you think to the very bottom They afford to find out Truth, your unsatisfied mind remains still in the same Labyrinth, in which it began first to unravel the Difficulty it sought after. Therefore, I hope, I may without begging your leave, or any one else, unless you produce your Patent to inhibit me, study the Scriptures on, and endeavour after a farther knowledge, which some would monopolize to themselves, in order to discover truth without assenting to an Opinion with a traditional Faith.

As for those of your Function, though they have in a more eminent manner, maliciously and with an unchristian Zeal scandaliz'd Estibius, yet he patiently bears with

The Epistle Dedicatory

with them without reviling, when they tell him from the Pulpit that Breath of Life, Gen. 2. 7. are only words put for and meant an Immaterial or Immortal Spirit of Man, though it is manifestly and in very words applyed to Beasts, Gen. 7. 22. he is not angry to hear you Preach as if Job had not rightly understood himself, when he says, Man that is born of a Woman, ch. 14. v. 1. and tells us that Job could mean but half the Man, seeing no Soul, his other half, can be generated. Nor doth it move his Spleen, or Laughter, to hear you tax Job of the same incongruity of Speech, ch. 14. v. 12. when he says, Man lyeth down, and riseth not till the Heavens be no more, they shall not awake, or be raised out of their Sleep; that he must mean the half part the Body of Man only, that lies down in the Grave, and will not be raised until the Heavens be no more. Notwithstanding it is no ways demonstrable, but rather the contrary, that Job had ever learnt that Man was compos'd of two such parts we now imagine him to be made of, but rather that he meant the whole Man, who was once a living Creature, would be rais'd a living Creature again when the Heavens be no more.

He

To the Prejudic'd Zealot.

Heavens were no more, or at the day of a General Judgment. And this agrees with his Description of the State of the Dead, as a State of perpetual Sleep and insensibility, in a Land where all things are Darkness and forgotten, Chap. 3. and 10. and makes him speak coherent with himself, not determining it a State of Life, or Man in effect never to die at all, as it would be if we lived in our Souls immediately, as soon as we are dead. Nor is he in the least troubled at Improperities of Speech (as he conceives) as Thou [Thief] shall be with me, &c. meaning as you say, but his half part, his Soul, Thou [Dives] hast had thy good things, &c. Luke 16. alluding only to the Soul of Dives, and not the Whole Man, &c. For Improperities of Speech frequently move laughter in Judicious Men, but seldom offend, if they are well meant and tend to a good End; though we know that there is no case else but this of the conception we have of the Union of a Soul and Body, as possible for you to give a Parallel, that Thou signifies only the half of Man. Different Relations and Compellations may be applied to the same Man, which never can infer upon that account the Union of two entire

2

The Epistle Dedicatory

with them without reviling, when they tell him from the Pulpit that Breath of Life, Gen. 2. 7. are only words put for and meant an Immaterial or Immortal Spirit of Man, though it is manifestly and in very words applyed to Beasts, Gen. 7. 2. he is not angry to hear you Preach as if Job had not rightly understood himself, when he says, Man that is born of a Woman, ch. 14. v. 1. and tells us that Job could mean but half the Man, seeing no Soul, his other half, can be generated. Nor doth it move his Spleen, or Laughter, to hear you tax Job of the same incongruity of Speech, ch. 14. v. 12. when he says, Man lyeth down, and riseth not till the Heavens be no more, they shall not awake, or be raised out of their Sleep; that he must mean the half part the Body of Man only, that lies down in the Grave, and will not be raised until the Heavens be no more. Notwithstanding it is no ways demonstrable, but rather the contrary, that Job had ever learnt that Man was compos'd of two such parts we now imagine him to be made of, but rather that he meant the whole Man, and as was once a living Creature, would be raised a living Creature again when the Heavens

To the Prejudic'd Zealot.

Heavens were no more, or at the day of a General Judgment. And this agrees with his Description of the State of the Dead, as a State of perpetual Sleep and insensibility, in a Land where all things are Darkness and forgotten, Chap. 3. and 10. and makes him speak coherent with himself, not determining it a State of Life, or Man in effect never to die at all, as it would be if we lived in our Souls immediately, as soon as we are dead. Nor is he in the least troubled at Improproprieties of Speech (as he conceives) as Thou [Thief] shall be with me, &c. meaning as you say, but his half part, his Soul, Thou [Dives] hast had thy good things, &c. Luke 16. alluding only to the Soul of Dives, and not the Whole Man, &c. For Improproprieties of Speech frequently move laughter in Judicious Men, but seldom offend, if they are well meant and end to a good End; though we know that no case else but this of the conception we have of the Union of a Soul and Body, is possible for you to give a Parallel, that Thou signifies only the half of Man. Different Relations and Compellations may be applied to the same Man, which never can suffer upon that account the Union of two entire

2

The Epistle Dedicatory.

entire Substances, v. g. My Lord is applicable in common use to those who are not really so, and Right Honourable to a Privy Councillor, tho' but a Commoner, &c. but when a Compellation is made to signify and applicable properly to, but half the Man, I cannot but cry out with the Poet (with a little variation) audis

Hæc, Lector, nec labra moves, cum
debueras si,
Democritus vel marmoreus, vel ahenus
esset? Juv. Sat. 13.

Therefore, Mr. Turner, what can you esteem us Laymen, who own we cannot understand, or comprehend well the meaning of Immaterial Substance, any other than Fools or stupid Dotards in your Opinion? If you bid the Countryman have regard to his wayes, and take care to keep his Soul unspotted from the World, he will be very apt to guess, if not plainly understand, what you mean, and take heed in his Life and Conversation to be blameless; but if you bid him take care of his Immaterial Substance, I cannot imagine less than that he would gape at his Teacher as if he design'd to show his Learning

To the Prejudic'd Zealot.

ther upon a Scholastick point, than believe
be intended to forewarn him in taking
care for his Soul. Thus is there brought
a general Reflection upon the whole Body of
the Laiety for being Ideots and Fools, be-
cause they cannot think, as you think, and
say as you say, contrary to plain Sense and
Words in other cases, but these you are
pleas'd to mention. For as to the Words
Spirit and Soul, we presume we understand
them, as well as most of your Function,
but when you bear us down that this must
mean an Immaterial Substance according
to the Holy Scriptures, with all the usu-
al pompous qualifications ascribed to it; 'tis
this Incongruity, Mr. Turner, we cannot
bear, by reason of the fatal consequences it
seems to bring on the very Fundamentals
of Christianity. But (say you) why should
you quarrel at Words easie to be under-
stood? Your Senses give you a Demonstra-
tion to comprehend what Substance is,
and then your understanding can as easily
abstract Matter from Substance, as well
as you can lines and tangents in the Ma-
thematically, what difficulty then remains
there in the conception of an Immaterial
Substance? It is the very conception, or
Idea we form of a God.

The Epistle Dedicatory

Indeed in my Opinion, it ought to be only the Idea of a God and no Being else, because the very expression is as incomprehensible in its meaning, as the Nature of God himself is; tho' according to your way of explaining it, 'tis as easie to comprehend the Nature of God by abstracting Matter, &c. as of Substance it self, tho' we publickly confess him to be a Being Incomprehensible. Away therefore with this bleating and bellowing of Argumentation in my Ears, let all Reflections be forgotten, all Heats and Animosities cease, so that our unchristian jarring here may not be a means to prevent our happy meeting in a blessed State hereafter.

Lastly, I will but add one thing more, and then conclude. Do we not, as it were by ocular Demonstration apprehend Death to be a meer privation of Life? This the Illiterate World, and Men unseason'd with Philosophical taint apprehend of it, and I believe, confess and own it so to be: But if such Men spring up, who are able to spoil those Illiterate, and well-meaning Believers thorough Philosophy, and vain Deceit, after the tradition of Men, after the Rudiments of the World, and not after Christ, Col. 2. 8. and the Tenour

To the Prejudic'd Zealot.

our of the Holy Scriptures; then the plain meaning and sense of the Words are presently inverted, and the Philosopher's Definitions made the Standards of our Christian Faith. The whole which we believ'd before true to our very Eyes, is rendred perplex to our understanding, and what we call'd the genuine signification of Death, is now become a Rent or Separation of two Substances, whereby the two Extrems, or termini oppositi (to use the Philosophic cant) become real Entities, or Beings, and Privation of Life or Death, nothing but a consequence of the aforesaid Separation. Now what is all this but a kind of a Platonic Philosophic Zeal? For Plato's Doctrine (as the learned Mr. Echard observes in his Church History) was only afforded many good Rules to the Primitive Christians, but was also a foundation for many Heresies, especially (says he pag. 8.) of the Carpocratians, an Heretical Sect, whose absurd Opinions Epiphanius (the Son of Carpocrates) spread abroad by means of the Platonic Philosophy, Ann. 130. Thus some Platonic Christians are without just reason believ'd to have composed the Books of the Sibylls, (vid. ibid.) wherein are many very good things intermingled with uncouth and wild conjectures. Upon (says a learned Author of our own

The Epistle Dedicatory

own Nation) from Philosophy the great Bane of the Church took its rise, and many of the Primitive Doctors and Fathers of the Church being converted from Heathenism, and having by long and great Industry acquired much knowledge in Natural Philosophy, Antiquity, History, subtle Logick or Sophistry were very willing to abandon those their long studied, and dearly beloved Sciences (false so call'd) and therefore translated them into Christianity, applying their School terms to Divine Matters, thro' indiscreet Zeal, to illustrate and embellish Christian Knowledge. For altho' I have elsewhere call'd the Knowledge of the Primitive Fathers of the Church in many cases Pious Ignorance, tho' they are evidently Learned as being Philosophers converted to Christianity, so still retaining their former Science I to avoid mistake or misapprehension in my Reader, do declare my meaning to be no otherwise than their Ignorance in the Christian Doctrines, in which they were but Beginners and Novices, and (as I am induc'd to believe) as Converts usually do, swallow down their Belief of the Christian Fundamental Principles with more Zeal, and eagerness than ordinary, which might prevent them from examining into the Mysteries

To the Prejudic'd Zealot.

points of their new adopted Religion, so nice-
as they ought to have done. Why must we
then adhere so close to the Philosophic De-
finition of Human Soul, as usually term'd
an Immaterial Substance? For indeed give
me leave but to play the Philosopher in the
like case, and grant me but what you would
grant to any Platonist, and I presume you
cannot find any difference in the parallel of
Light and Darknes, v. g. It is a common-
receiv'd, and I believe, true Opinion that
Darkness is a meer Privation of Light, and
that Light is an Emanation of Rays from a
Lucid, or Illuminated Body, which Light
and Darknes in Twilight seem to be so in-
timately united, that its impossible to assign
sometimes which is predominant. Now if
you'l but grant me that Darknes is a Sub-
stance (because it may be felt, Ex. 10. 21.)
as well as Light, which all new Philosophers
consent it to be, the Parallel of this Union,
and separation, with that of the Soul and Bo-
dy, is so easie to be made out by Philosophy,
that nothing will appear more plain to make
Darknes it self a Substance in spite of that
true Notion of it, as its defin'd a meer Pri-
vation of Light. For when you tell me that
Death is a Privation of Life, consequent on-
ly to the Separation of the two Substances,
Soul and Body, then I reply, that Dark-
ness

The Epistle Dedicatory, &c.

ness is only a Privation of Light consequent to the Separation of the two Substances of Light and Darknes, united in Twilight, as the Soul and Body are united in Living Man. Oh! but say you, the parallel is not true, for Darknes is agreed on to be a meer Privation and not a Substance; so say I, is Death, if you would let it be so. Well, but Death is made by the Separation of two Substances, and Life by their Union; so is Darknes and Light in Twilight made one or the other by Separation or Union in proportion as one is united to the other, or totally separated. But how do you prove Darknes a Substance? I reply, how do you prove the Soul by which we live, to be a Substance? Here ends the main point of the Controversie, and farther than this I believe the most Philosophical head in the World cannot reach: Therefore, Mr. Turner, let you and I, and I hope all good Christians seek out some better principles to relye on than purely Philosophical, and what Heathens have deriv'd unto us, especially if they seem to be such as subvert the Fundamentals of Christianity, and endeavour most after that Learning by which we may become Wise unto Salvation:

(1)

DIALOGUE

BETWEEN A
SUBSTANIMIST
AND A
VITANIMIST.

Subst. **W**ELL met, Mr. *Vitanimist*;
I have sought you in several
Places, but have had the Misfortune not to meet
you till now. Pray, have you seen a late *Erroneous and Dangerous Book*, call'd, *Second Thoughts concerning Human Soul*?

Vit. Yes, Sir, I have read it over twice
or thrice with great Care and Diligence,
but do not find it so *Erroneous or Dangerous*
as you pretend. Whoever it was that Wrote
it, seems to be an ingenious Gentleman and
a Schollar.

B

Psych.

The Epistle Dedicatory, &c.

ness is only a Privation of Light consequent to the Separation of the two Substances of Light and Darknes, united in Twilight, as the Soul and Body are united in Living Man. Oh! but say you, the parallel is not true, for Darknes is agreed on to be a meer Privation and not a Substance; so say I, is Death, if you would let it be so. Well, but Death is made by the Separation of two Substances, and Life by their Union; so is Darknes and Light in Twilight made one or the other by Separation or Union in proportion as one is united to the other, or totally separated. But how do you prove Darknes a Substance? I reply, how do you prove the Soul by which we live, to be a Substance? Here ends the main point of the Controversie, and farther than this I believe the most Philosophical head in the World cannot reach: Therefore, Mr. Turner, let you and I, and I hope all good Christians seek out some better principles to rely on than purely Philosophical, and what Heathens have deriv'd unto us, especially if they seem to be such as subvert the Fundamentals of Christianity, and endeavour most after that Learning by which we may become Wise unto Salvation.

A
DIALOGUE
 BETWEEN A
SUBSTANIMIST
 AND A
VITANIMIST.

Subst. **W**ELL met, Mr. *Vitanimist*;
 I have sought you at several Places, but have had the Misfortune not to meet you till now. Pray, have you seen a late *Erroneous and Dangerous Book*, call'd, *Second Thoughts concerning Human Soul*?

Vit. Yes, Sir, I have read it over twice or thrice with great Care and Diligence, but do not find it so *Erroneous or Dangerous* as you pretend. Whoever it was that Wrote it, seems to be an ingenious Gentleman and a Schollar.

B

Psych.

Subst. What? I believe you are one of his Disciples; but let you and I reason together about that *Pernicious Principle*; for I tell you, he is an *Achan* that *has troubled our Israel with an accursed thing*. Sir, do you consider what it is to *Debauch* People in their Principles?

Vit. Hold, Sir, do you consider the limits of extravagant Zeal? Your Passion hurries you too fast; for my part, he seems rather to have discovered an *Achan* that has long troubled the *Israel of our God*, than to be One. And methinks I see the Question in your Countenance, *Ahab* propos'd to the Prophet *Elijah*, *hast thou found me, O mine Enemy*, when he taxed him before to be the Troubler of all *Israel*, 1 Kings 21. 20.

Subst. What then! Would you not have me *Zealous in a good Cause*? Do you think that after we have Possess'd, and Enjoy'd for these several thousand Years an *Immaterial Substance*, call'd *Human Soul*, and a *Spiritual Substance*, we must at last be rob'd of it by a few Criticisms of a *Pretended Learned Author*? How came he to be wiser than his Fore-fathers for so many Generations together? What Gift of Interpretation of Scriptures doth he assume to himself above the rest of Mankind?

Vit. Not too many Questions at once, good Mr. *Substantivist*; you mistake the Point, and tax his Opinion as *Dangerous*, *Erroneous* and *Pernicious*, without giving any Reason

Reasons of Conviction, notwithstanding *He promises to Recant, if any one can convince him*; and until such Conviction can be made, let You and I *fairly and candidly* debate the Controversie in Writing, without scurrilous Railing, or unchristian Reflections from the Pulpit, or Press. For all Persons of your Character and Function ought to be Healers of Divisions arising (if they so do) upon the account of mistaken Interpretation, or Male-construction, not with *Bigotry and Immoderate Zeal* to prosecute the supposed Criminal. For if once Bigotry lead the Van, and the Cloak of a Spiritual Function becomes the Coverture of a *Politick or Erroneous unchristian Zeal*; it is in my Opinion, such a Baseness of Temper, as has scarce its parallel in the World; and as it comes from Men of your Dignity and Profession, if accompanied with Scurrility, the villany of the Fact becomes more *eminently odious*, as the Persons are more conspicuous in your Stations. But I hope, *He that Sits as a Refiner's Fire, will purifie such Sons of Levi, and purge them as Silver and Gold, that they may offer unto the Lord an Offering of Righteousness to atone for their Passionate Unchristian Zeal.*

Subst. So, Mr. *Vitanimist*, I find you read the Scripture, but you seem to be so Bigotted to *Eschinas's Principles of Human Soul*, that I am afraid I shall scarce be able to bridle my Passion, while I argue with you.

about this uncouth and unheard-of Opinion.

Vit. Come let us try what may be done, I do assure you, that you shall not put me into a Passion.

Subst. You? No, you are a thing without a Soul, How then can you be put into a Passion?

Vit. As for my self, I'll not recriminate, but for *Estibius*, I must say, he Writes with *Life and Spirit*, although he has no Soul, called an *Immaterial Substance*; nor yet owns any separate Existence of such an immortal Being in Man; so that we are still the same Men, though not the same Composition.

Subst. Oh! but have not you read my *Vindication of the Separate Existence and Immortality of the Soul*? Do not I make it as plain as A. B. C. from the Holy Scriptures, that Man must necessarily have such an *Immaterial Substance*, which goes to Heaven or Hell, or to some place of Initial Happiness, or Misery, as soon as separated from the Body? in spite of all opposition of that bold *Assertor who begs the Question, and then brings Scripture to his own Sense in Defence of it.* Vind. p. 19.

Vit. No, Mr. *Substanimist*, I do not see your Arguments cogent enough to byass my Judgment, much less perhaps *Estibius's*. But seeing you are willing to traverse the point with as little Passion as you can, let us go on gradually as soon as I have reply'd to your preliminary Questions. For I suppose

pose you design with them to skirmish a little before you bring up your Grand Army, or main Body of Reasons. And seeing also you are now grown something calm, I will endeavour to satisfy you in every one; but, before, you was so Passionate, as if *Estibius* were invading your Rights and Properties, or had informed against you to turn you out of your Preferment for being a Non-juror.

Subst. Passionate? What do you think only the Fear of losing my Preferment will put me into a Passion? No, I am zealous for the Honour of the Lord God of Hosts, and Religion, and would have you to know, that the Invasion of Men of Atheistical Principles upon the Rights of the Holy Scriptures will raise in me a greater Passion than the loss of all the Preferment in the World. *The infamous and scandalous Reflections this Opinion brings on Religion, Vind.* p. 41. the blemish your Author brings on the Piety of the Fathers of the Church, by a bold imputation of Ignorance and Folly, &c. p. 21. are such things as would put any sober Christian into a Passion, especially when he says, *The Soul of Man dies with the Body,* which all the World has held Immortal, and does not revive until a general Resurrection, which is contrary to the common sentiments of nine parts in ten of Mankind, p. 1.

Vit. This is a very great Charge indeed, but first lets examine the Preliminaries before mention'd; because they are common, though but trivial Objections, and then I'll warrant you, I will sufficiently answer the Charge.

Subst. Come then; after we have been possess'd of, and enjoy'd a *Soul*, call'd an *Immaterial Immortal Substance* several thousand Years, why must we be rob'd of it by a few Criticisms of a pretended learned Author? Answer me, Sir, that if you can?

Vit. How this Author robs you of Life Eternal, as you will be rais'd a *Living Creature* at the Resurrection, by the inferences of his Doctrine, it is impossible for you, or any one else to show; which is the very same, as Immortality. What Reflection is then to Religion, or injury to *Man*? I am sure it is according to the express Words of the Holy Scriptures; but if he denies you to be compounded of *Body and an Immaterial Substance*, you must some way or other give sufficient proof for it, or else certainly it may be denied without Cavil, or Exprobration. And if all the plea you have to justify the Truth of your Opinion be only *Antiquity*, pray tell me how *ancient* do you think *Idolatry* is? Must it therefore be received, and believed to be true? How many hundred years old is *Mahometism*? Is it necessary therefore that we should embrace it? You find that in the first planting of
Christ.

Christianity, that *Heresies* grew up with it, must those *Heresies* be therefore esteem'd true and Orthodox Doctrines? Sure I am, Mr. *Substanimist*, the plea of the Antiquity of an Opinion, never gives an indelible stamp to the truth of it; because we know *Errors* have for many Ages together, been propagated with as great Zeal down to Posterity, as the most Fundamental Truths of Religion.

Subst. Well, Sir, this I know to be true; but is there any comparison between *Idolatry*, *Mahometism* and *Heresies*, being propagated down from Generation to Generation, and the Doctrine of an *Immortal Spiritual Substance*, which Jews, Heathens, Turks and Infidels believe!

Vit. I think the Parallel is very plain, and needs no farther illustration, as to the plea brought from *Antiquity*, if you bring no better proofs to invalidate this Opinion. And on the other hand, this Opinion, tho' but *New*, may unquestionably with better reason, demand our Belief, if that of an *Immaterial Immortal Distinct Substance* be proved to be inconsistent to the true Principles of Christian Religion.

Subst. Ay, prove but that, and I'll say something to you: But seeing it confounds the *immediate Immortality of the Soul*, 'tis that Doctrine which sounds so abominably in every good Man's Ears, I cannot, I tell

you, I will not bear it, 'tis a scandal to Christianity.

Vit. You see how Zeal blinds your Understanding, and makes your Passion boyl up beyond its Bounds. For I must tell you, that you mistake the whole point of the Controversie, the Question being, *Whether Man is compos'd of Body and an Immaterial Substance, call'd Soul.* And not *whether that Immaterial Substance be Immortal.* For if it be once proved Man has in him that *Immaterial Substance*, immortality follows of course, and *Estibius* himself, nor any Body that I know, will deny it; but then he tells you, and I presume proves it almost demonstratively, *That the Heathens were the only Inventors of that Notion of Human Soul, upon which account we ought to reject it as inconsistent with Christianity.*

Subst. Nay, if that be the grand point of the Controversie, why did he not tell us so, but put such a frightful Title to his Book. For, I declare, I thought with the popular cry that it was a Book wrote *directly* against the *Immortality of the Soul of Man*, and not against the Philosophical Notion of it. But however, let me tell you; if you once discard that Philosophical Notion of it, you plainly destroy its Immortality, because you destroy its Existence.

Vit. Methinks you strangely harp upon the word *Immortality*, would you not first be well satisfied that any thing has a Being,

ing, before you ascribe Immortality to that
 being? Especially seeing the Holy Scrip-
 tures, the best ground of all Argumenta-
 tion in this Case, never mentions the words
Immortal Soul, or *Immortality of the Soul*,
 or a *Soul that never dies*, or any equivalent
 sentence to it in the whole Bible. Now,
 as I hinted before, if the Heathens have
 joined a Notion of *Human Soul*, inconsis-
 tent with Reason, and the Principles of
 Christian Religion, what grounds have we
 to embrace it as true! I confess, *Estivius* uses
 the *Medium* to prove the Non-existence of
 that *Immaterial Substance* from the Corrup-
 tibility of the *whole Man*, as he is suppo-
 sed to consist of two distinct Substances,
viz. Soul and Body; but this seems not to
 be the main and principal end of his Argu-
 mentation, but only to destroy that Notion
 of Human Soul, which he conceives to be
 highly prejudicial to Christianity.

Subst. But why doth he urge it then that
 the Soul of Man must therefore be Mor-
 tal, p. 133. *Second Thoughts.*

Vit. What would you have him say?
 He is arguing against the Philosophers in
 their own way, and according to their own
 principles, which future Christians built their
 Notion on; now if they had erected to
 themselves a Notion they could not defend,
 he must use some *Medium* or other to
 make good an Argument against them;
 and that he there insists upon, is from the
 con-

consequence of their own Doctrines, which *Immortality* might be as justly ascribed according to them, to the Souls of Brutes, as of Rational Creatures.

Subst. And is this all? But methinks he shoots his Dart thorough a Wood as were, and whilst he aims at Philosophy confounds Christianity.

Vit. Truly, what you think, I judge not, but I would very gladly know why you think so. For I have perus'd the Book very seriously and considerately, and do not find in it the least Reflection on Religion. Those indeed that never read it, condemn that with violence for no other Reason that I know, but because they were *bid* or *advised* never to read it, in order to joyn in the popular Noise and decry it. Such ways of Confutation have some Men who can make the ignorance of others a meer Stalking-horse to their Designs, and keep them blind, lest their Eyes should be opened, and they call their Advisers Fools. For, on my Conscience, I think the Gentleman deserves rather a good Reward for his pains in discovering so long an unquestion'd Error, than all this Clamor and Reflections that have been made upon him for it.

Subst. Reward! For what I pray? I believe if it were in the Power of such a one as you, you would give him a Bishop's prick, because he has started a pretty, odd, fine, pleasing Notion for your Palate.

hop

hope the Convocation will take it under their Cognizance, and publickly condemn it of Atheism and Irreligion.

Vit. Truly if all the Convocation were made up of such passionate Men as you, I do not doubt, but that right or wrong, they would like the Alderman *Eslibius* mentions, page 13, 14. *Second Thoughts*, vote the Author an *Atheist*, and his Book an *Heretical Pasquil*. But I hope, Mr. *Substanimist*, you mistake the Temper and Genius of Men, plac'd in that Dignity and Station: They'll examine first whether it be the *Foxe's Ears* that appears, before they rashly pronounce them to be *Horns*. Such as you indeed may.

Subst. Why, Sir, What may I do? Spare your Reflections I beseech you, Sir.

Vit. Nothing at all, Sir, I say nothing but that you may sometimes urge an Argument to no purpose, as well as others. For give me leave to tell you, where Power exerts it self by a *Sic Volo, Sic Jubeo* (as where a Popish Inquisition domineers, it doth) it may force an outward compliance, but never brings a Conviction, and as it augments the number of Hypocrites, so *pari passu* do the secret Profelytes rather increase than diminish.

Subst. Come, this is not to our point; pray tell me, *How should he be wiser than his Forefathers for many Generations together, who all believed Man to have an Immaterial*
and

and Immortal Substance, call'd Soul: And how comes he to have the gift of Interpretation above other Men! For I will put both these Questions together to shorten our Discourse, and indeed I would not have mentioned them at all, had I not heard them so frequently bandied about in common Conversation.

Vit. By your leave, Mr. *Substanimist*, I think you put the Question wrong; it should be, *How came he to hit on this Notion, that Life and Soul are the same thing, and to discover Man not to be compounded of Body and an Immaterial Substance?* For as to his being Wiser than others is not the point, and I hope he may have liberty to *Learn, Mark, and inwardly digest* the Holy Scriptures as well as another; and if they speak it, who dares contradict it?

Subst. When that demonstratively appears. I'll be of your side too, but he must not think to take *false Notions*, pag. 38. out of them, and make them Embellishments of his Learning.

Vit. No, there I agree with you, but if there be a far greater probability that the Holy Scriptures did generally mean *Life* by the word *Soul*, and that may inferences be deduced from the Nature of an Immaterial, or Spiritual Substance (if the Soul be made in Scripture to signify such) that it cannot be an Opinion consistent with our Reveal'd Religion, What will you say then?

Subst.

Subst. If you are able to do it, then I'll
 e of your Opinion, but if I demonstrate
 to you the contrary Doctrine to be true,
 then you must come over to me. For al-
 though you Decry, and Defame the Au-
 thority of the Primitive Fathers to serve a
 turn, whose Testimonies I take to be a ve-
 ry good Argument, besides the Holy Scrip-
 tures against you, yet I cannot forbear to
 tell you, *Vind.* p. 57. That it is a Real dis-
 advantage to, and a just exception against
 any New or uncommon Opinion, that it is
 contrary to the receiv'd Doctrines of the
 most early and Primitive Christians.

Vit. I have as great a Deference and Re-
 verence for the Primitive Fathers of the
 Church, as you can have; but, with sub-
 mission, I must beg leave to dissent from
 them, if I perceive they Deviate from the
 great Standard of Truth, i. e. the Holy
 scriptures. It is evidently plain to any one
 that reads them, that in several points they
 were Erroneous, and *Origen* in particular:
 however, I will allow that it is a great de-
 timent to the ready embracing of an Opi-
 nion at first, not to have the Primitive
 Writers of our side, but yet upon serious
 consideration, and more mature Deliberation
 we may have just Reason to disagree with
 their Sentiments.

Subst. But does not *He* think that we
 that converse daily with all Commentators
 and Expositors on the Holy Scriptures are
 better,

Subst.

better able, and with more grounds of probability of Truth, to interpret them than he is; *How comes he to have the gift of Interpretation above others?* I think I have plainly refuted several Interpretations of his, and substituted more Genuine of my own.

Vit. Have you? That will then manifestly appear by and by; but for *Estibius's* ability in Interpretation of Scripture above others, I do not believe he claims any, nay not an equality to several; but where the Text seems Natural, and easie to be understood, and the Contexts are explanatory in some measure of the Text, and the sense of other places in Scripture concenter in the same meaning in those Languages, particularly in which they were originally wrote, what need we more to guide us to a right Interpretation, if we have Learning enough to do this?

Subst. Nay, I presume no Body now-a-days pretends to Divine Inspiration, yet it is manifest that *Estibius* frames several Arguments from Scripture, according to his own Notions, which the sense of words do not mean, *Vind.* p. 36.

Vit. If he doth not, I am sure you do, and sometimes leave out half the Context to make good your Argument.

Subst. Prove that if you can, Sir, I know you will say any thing to justify an Heretodox point; you are a lover of Novelties perhaps, but I enquire after the Old ways, and

and the Old paths wherein our Forefathers walked, and in them and in no other am I resolv'd to Walk. For I can never be of Opinion that the *Soul of Man* dies, and will not receive until the *Resurrection*, contrary to the sentiments of nine parts in ten of the World. What! my *Spiritual Substance* die? It is an unpardonable Novelty, *Vind. p. 1.*

Vit. Pray, Sir, soft and fair, you begin methinks to stumble at the very Entrance; there is no Man that I know says, or ever did say, that your *Soul*, as call'd a *Spiritual Substance*, was *Mortal*; why *Eschius* urg'd against the Philosophers, he has told you just now, for he delivers it not, as an Opinion of his own, but uses it as a *Medium* against them, yet you flatly charge it against him, and urge withal one strange Reason why it should be Erroneous and rejected, *Because it is contrary to the sentiments of nine parts in ten of all Ages, p. 1.*

Subst. Yes, I do aver it to be a good Reason, why Mankind should not entertain such an Opinion as Orthodox.

Vit. Do you so? Truly I think you very much mistaken; the first rise we have of this Opinion (which we may from History call most Authentick) was amongst the *Egyptians*, who were not nine parts in ten of the then inhabited World. So pray how do you account for that Age? Besides, What think you of Christianity at the first Propagation thereof? Must it therefore be rejected

jected because *nine parts in ten*, nay I may say, 9000 parts to one, believed and adhered to Idolatry? Your Reasons for your belief of Christianity are very weak and unstable, if you can bring no other to confirm it.

Subst. Hold! I mean our latter Ages. For by *Estibius's* own Opinion, we are got, say I, to the Holy Scriptures as the first Foundation, and occasion of the Doctrine of the Immortality of Human Soul. He confesses *Plato* had it from the *Ægyptians*, and the *Ægyptians* from *Moses*, but then to serve a turn, he tells you without proof *That they had it by misinterpretation and Malconstruction of the Books of Moses*, *Vind.* p. 3. However still it came from *Moses*, and therefore it cannot be a plain *Heathenish Invention*.

Vit. But who taught the *Ægyptians* this Doctrine before *Moses* came into *Ægypt*? For *Moses* was learned in all the Wisdom or Learning of the *Ægyptians*, *Acts* 7. 22. which Wisdom undoubtedly consisted not only in Astrological and Magical Sciences, very much then in Vogue amongst them, but also in the mysterious parts of their Religion, which they profess'd long before ever *Moses* came into *Ægypt*. And that this Doctrine of the Immortality of their Souls was a principal part of it, is allow'd on by all hands, although they never defined the Nature of their Immortal Souls. Therefore

Moses

Moses could not be properly the Original of that Doctrine which was professed long before *He* was Born. For even the *Chaldeans* and *Sabeans* by a Chronological computation professed this Doctrine, before ever the Books of *Moses* were publish'd, or extant, nay long before the Children of *Israel's* captivity in *Ægypt*, vid. Mr. *Stanley's* Lives of the Philosophers.

Subst. What? you seem to insinuate, as if *Moses* learned that Doctrine from the *Egyptians*; but I say, it was really and truly *ab Origine* from *Moses*, according to the Genuine sense of his Writings, and I believe that *Mankind* had never had any knowledge of the *Souls* separate *Existence* and *Immortality* but from *Revelation*, Vind. p. 2.

Vit. If *Moses* had reveal'd to us in his Writings such a Doctrine of the *Immortality* and *Existence* of our separate *Souls*, notwithstanding what Heathens before, or after him had said, I should have rejected their Authority, because his was delivered by *Divine Inspiration*. Now whereas *Moses* never mentions the least Word of an Immortal Self-subsisting Soul, as a distinct Being from the Body, but generally uses it for *Person*, or *Living Creature*, I am very apt to believe *He* look'd upon such a Doctrine, as purely *Heathenish*. For had there been some such Doctrine approved of by *Him*, it is highly probable *He* would have cultivated it from its *Errors* (as the Heathens frequently in-

C

termix'd

termix'd Truths and Falsities together) and delivered it down clear and entire to Posterity. But as *He* is totally silent as to its *Immateriality*, or *Immortality*, or *Self-subsistence*, I look upon it as a good Argument that *He* esteemed it an *Heathenish Principle*, and inconsistent with the Jewish Religion.

Subst. Why then doth *Estibius* assert that it came Originally from the *Ægyptians*, who learned it from *Moses*? and yet deny that it had its first rise from expressions in the Holy Scripture, which I as positively assert, *Vind. pag. 5.*

Vit. You will mistake, and justify it when you have done. You assert things very frequently positively indeed, but *Estibius* gives you that rise of the Opinion, only as a rational Conjecture, but when *He* has traversed it a little, *He* seems not to confide in it, but says, *whoever they were that first broached this Doctrine of Human Soul, were Heathens, vid. pag. 357. cap. 10.* So that you do him wrong in your Quotations. This plain belief of those ignorant Heathen Nations in comparison of the Greeks, Philosophers in future Ages cultivated with many Attributes, and flourishes upon its admirable Perfections.

Subst. Well, Sir, go on I pray, I see you are very tenacious of your *Heretical Doctrine*. Pray what think you of *Estibius's* Reasons, why the Philosophers embraced the

the Doctrine of the Immortality of Human Soul; because, forsooth, they knew nothing of future Rewards for the Just, who lived virtuously in this World, but were very oft oppress'd with Afflictions and Miseries seemingly more than others, whilst the thriving wicked Man flourish'd in plenty, and went quietly in peace to the Grave. They could not unriddle.

*What Providential Springs
Exalt the Poor, and humble mighty Kings.
Why Fate a while the thriving Knave does
bless,
Batt'ning in Ease, and glutted with Suc-
cess;
Whilst the Religious seem to starve, and
die
Neglected, even by God to whom they fly.*

Vit. Why, if this puzzled even David himself, do not you think the Wisdom of Heathens was very great to devise such a Notion, as might answer the Justice of God; which these sufferings of the Just in this World seem'd to call in question? For whether their God was a true, or a false God, they were unwilling to have him an unjust God, so that the Rewards and Punishments in the Souls of Men they had devised every way answer'd for the Justice of their God.

Subst. But this has not the least Glance toward the surviving of the *Soul*, no more than the Resurrection of the *Body*, nor doth it explain the *Modus* of a future State. For *undeniably* that Doctrine had its Rise from the Scriptures, *Vin. pag. 4.*

Vit. Not so *undeniably* neither; for, as I told you, that Doctrine of the *Souls Immortality* was taught long before *Moses*.

Subst. Nay, good Mr. *Vitanimist*, there I have you; if it was a Doctrine before *Moses*, how could the Philosophers be the Original of this Opinion, upon the account of *Virtue* being unrewarded, and *Vice* unpunish'd in this World?

Vit. Truly, Mr. *Substanimist*, you have not a very distinguishing Head; for you run all along upon the *Souls Immortality*, and not the grand Point, *viz.* its *Immaterial Substance*. Besides, you run so fast a Man can hardly overtake you; I never said the Philosophers were the Original of this Opinion, but were only the Original of the *Reasons* given for this Opinion, *viz.* *Vice* and *Virtue*, &c. Because, Philosophers love to give a *Reason* for what they assert, which many do not care to do; Why may not then the Ancient Heathens believe an Opinion without any solid *Reason*, which Philosophers may embrace with an apparent *Reason* for their belief?

Subst.

Subst. That indeed is probable enough; but how doth this explain the *Modus* of a future State? *Vind.* p. 4.

Vit. You never heard me say, it did, though I must tell you, that it has some umbrage of a very good Argument to all sober Men, not acquainted with *Reveal'd Religion*, to encourage them to persevere constant in virtuous *Actions*, upon the account of future *Rewards*, though they were miserable in this World, by assuring them, as much as the light of Philosophy could do, that in their Souls they should be rewarded in another World, and not totally perish. I am sure St. Paul thought such an Argument very good, when He says, upon the account of Persecution, *We Christians of all Men should be most miserable*, 1 Cor. 15. Now if you think St. Paul urg'd not a rational Argument to the *Corinthians*, I will joyn hands and condemn all the Philosophers as Fools and Ideots.

Subst. But heark you, Sir, you are not come up to the Point yet; I say there is no connexion between a Future State and an *Immortal Soul*. They might have as well assured them of the Resurrection of the Body, as well as Surviving of the Soul.

Vit. Indeed, Mr. *Substantivist*, I am of your Opinion, so they might, had there been the same probable Grounds that they should so readily have obtained a belief.

For I must tell you, because you seem not to know it, that those Old Fellows were wise and understanding Men, and did not usually broach Opinions where the Evidence of Sense could contradict them; and they well knew the difference to promise a Reward for a *manifest visible corrupt Substance*, call'd *Body*, by a reviving of it; and for an *Invisible Immaterial Substance*, to whom they had given the Attribute of *Immaterial* to make it *Immortal*. The former they could not do without the knowledge of a *Resurrection*, which they were wholly ignorant of; and the latter they might promise to do, because they found a notion impossible to be contradicted by the Senses of an *Immaterial Invisible Substance*, which every way suited to their Doctrines, and solv'd all Philosophical Difficulties, by bestowing *Immortality* on it.

Subst. Ay, solv'd all Difficulties, just as *Estibins* does, by a direct contradiction of himself, pag. 9. That *Doctrine*, or belief is most agreeable to a *Rational Nature*, which is most easy to be comprehended and understood, as having in it most probable Grounds of Truth, *Vind*, pag. 5. But pag. 101. He tell us the quite contrary, viz. That to make an *Immaterial Spiritual Being*, whose very Notion implies *Activity*, to be the Principle of all Operations in Man, is far more easily conceivable to be done, [by that active Principle] than to create an active power in dull heavy unactive

inactive matter, by which it is enabled to perform all those noble Operations it doth. Now is not this a plain contradiction in this great Master of Logick and Philosophy, to prove Both from the easiness of comprehending.

Vit. Truly, I cannot yet tell what to call it, for line 18. it is contrary, and line 25. it is contradictory to himself, then let it be call'd a contrary-contradictory Tenet. But, good, Sir, without trifling with you, where lies the Contradiction: He says, It is far more easie to conceive a Mortal, and perishable Principle to be conjoyned to a Mortal also, than to an Immortal Being. This I presume a very true proposition stated in respect of the Union of the Soul with Man, and its perishableness. Now when He talks of the Principle of Activity or Actions in Man, He tells you, It is far more easie to conceive a Spirit to be the Original of all Actions, than it is to conceive [God] to create an Active Power in dull matter to be the principle of all Actions.

Subst. Very Good! And have you the confidence to say these are not Contradictions?

Vit. Yes, I will boldly assert it, seeing you call me a bold Assertor pretty often, and if you had been Master of Logick and Philosophy, you must have known that Contradictions must relate to the same thing; as every Man is Rational, no Man is Rational,

Rational, are contradictory Propositions, and *referuntur ad Idem*, say we Logicians. But what is easie for Man's Conceptions, in respect of his Corruptibility, and what is easie for Man's Conceptions *in respect of the power of God to create*, are far from being Contradictions, much less Contrarieties. The original of Man's Corruption, and of his Vital and Rational Actions, are two different things, but far from a Contradiction, especially seeing the latter refers to a third thing, *viz.* the Power of God in creating a Principle of Activity.

Subst. I hope I am not to learn of you at these Years, I will still maintain that *Esse sibi* contradicts himself.

Vit. Well, let it be so then, you shall have your way, no Book of Bulk can be remembred all at once, neither is it to the merit of the Cause, if there be other Arguments to prove his Opinion; for God help you, if I should unravel your *contrary-contradictory* Sentences; but I refer *Esse sibi* to the Reader's Judgment. However let us go to the Scripture Texts.

Subst. First, Sir, let me know what *Principles* you are of, for I observe in most of your Arguments, one may fairly deny either your *Principles* or *Conclusions*.

Vit. *Principles*? I suppose you mean *Premisses*, which are the two first parts of a Syllogism; now this is no Contradiction, but a kind of a Blunder. But if you would know

know my *Principles* in relation to the point in Controverſie, I am a *Vitanimiſt*, one who holds Man not compounded of an *Immaterial Subſtance*, call'd *Soul*, and a *Material Subſtance*, call'd *Body*; but do boldly *Aſſert* (as you ſay pag. 6.) that He is compounded only of *Life and Body*, if you will let me uſe the word *compounded* in this Caſe.

Subſt. You may uſe it as you pleaſe, to expreſs your *Sentiments*; but I preſume, you mean, that Man is made up of *Life and Body*, not as of two Subſtantial Parts as the *Soul and Body* are, but as an *Accident*, and *Subſtance*; and you aſſert *Soul and Life to be the ſame thing meant in Scripture* in relation to Man's *Composition*, but I ſhall deny it; for *Life and Body* are not really diſtinguiſh'd.

Vit. As much as *Soul and Body* are, till you can prove that *Soul* of yours to be a *Subſtance*. And becauſe the *Scripture* is the *Touch-ſtone* we are to be tryed by, what think you of that Text of our Saviour, *Take no care for your Life, what ye ſhall Eat, or what ye ſhall Drink, nor yet for the Body what ye ſhall put on.* Is not the *Life* more than *Meat*, and the *Body* than *Raiment*, *Mat. 6. v. 25.* which very words are again recited, *Luke 12. v. 22, 23.* and are in the *Greek* ~~word~~ in both places, which others call *Soul*: Don't you think here is a ſufficient *Diſtinction*?

Subſt.

Subst. Yes, as an Accident and Subject are distinguish'd, but there's not a substantial distinction between *Life* and *Body*, as there is between *Soul* and *Body*.

Vit. Now don't you plainly see this answer begs the Question; for if I don't grant your Composition to be of two Substances, your answer is to no purpose; and yet this must be your answer, or none, seeing you allow not *Life* and *Soul* to be meant the same thing in the Scripture.

Subst. No I cannot in reason allow it, for when you pretend to prove it, there you fail in your promised Demonstration, and put us off with Trifles, *Vind. p. 7.* For if *Life* and *Soul* were the same thing, how does this demonstrate that *Soul* in the sacred Language never imports *more* than *Life*? or that it so signifies *Life*, as not to include also a distinct Substance, the cause of that *Life*, *Vind. pag. 8.*

Vit. Why so nice and critical, Mr. *Substanimist*, in your Question? I think it is an evident Demonstration, that if *Life* and *Soul* be the same thing, it is neither a Substance, nor *Immortal*. But then say you, produce your Texts where it *never* imports *more* than *Life*, and where it doth *not* signify *Life* and a distinct Substance too. Now do you think this is fair Arguing?

Subst. Yes, I do, for if you would prove any thing from Scripture, you must bring proof from thence, must you not, to prove it?

Vit.

Vit. That I readily grant, where it lies on me to prove, but not in this case where you require *Negatives* to be proved. The fairest way would have been for you to have brought several Texts to demonstrate where the word *Soul* imports more than *Life*, and includes a *distinct Substance* also, this was the right way of a Philosopher, and a Master of Logick.

Subst. Oh! I find what you aim at, you would have me prove by evident Texts the *Soul* of Man a Substance, and to signify more than *Life*. That you shall see I'll do by and by beyond all contradiction; but first let's examine *Estibius's* Reasons, why Man has not that distinct *Immortal Substance*, capable of existing separately after Death; because (forsooth, saith He) *Knowledge would be her essential Attribute, and consequently the Soul of Man might sometime or other give us an Account of the Affairs of the other World*, S. Th. pag. 207. which no *Lazarus* ever did that He heard or read of, or sent thither. I own that few, very few indeed ever returned from the Dead, and if they did, might be under a *Restraint* or *Incapacity* to give us an account of the other World, *Vind.* pag. 9.

Vit. I protest you begin to move my Passion to hear you thus argue; *The Souls in a state of Separation have Knowledge, but no body in this World ever knew that they had.* This is the full purport of your Argument,

gument, and as far as I see it requires us to believe without proof, that the Souls have knowledge in a Separate State. All matter of Faith still. But pray, how can you say, any Man has knowledge if no Body ever knew it? It is Conversation brings a discovery of knowledge, one way or other; now if these Spirits or Souls had a *Restraint or Incapacity* upon them, not to discover their knowledge, what Reason have we to believe they have any knowledge at all?

Subst. Oh! but some *few*, though very *few* have return'd from the Dead.

Vit. What do you mean, *Souls* of the Deceased or *Persons*? If *Persons*, I tell you plainly I believe none ever rose from the Dead, but by the power of our Saviour, and his Apostles. If you mean *either* since our Saviour's time, that rose from the Dead, after Corruption in the Grave, I would be very willingly inform'd how you come to know they rose *from the Dead*, if they had not a power to discover whence they came, as being hindred by Omnipotent *Restraint or Incapacity*? Your own imaginary Fancy may raise a *Spirit* or *Soul*, (as you call them Separate Existing Substances) but if it be a *Spirit* without converse, how know you it came from the Dead? A Diabolical Illusion may affright you, and a good Angel may appear (for I neither deny Angels, or Spirits,) though
you

you tax *Estibius* of Sadducism, which denies both. *Vind. pag. 18.* though with me these Apparitions are but meer probabilities, and I am very doubtful whether in these latter Ages we ever have them at all, seeing *Moses* and the Prophets, and our Reveal'd Religion, are a better information for us to gain Heaven by, than though one rose from the Dead. Therefore your *few*, your *very few*, I doubt are none at all, and the returns of Souls or Persons from the Dead is all but a Religious Cheat, and Popish Fiction.

Subst. Well, but *Estibius* says, if the Soul were a Spiritual Substance and Immortal, then the Soul of a dead Man might praise God, *pag. 209. Second Thoughts.*

Vit. And is not the consequence very true, if they are such separate self-subsisting Substances of an Angelical Nature, might they not praise God in that state of Separation from the Body?

Subst. Yes, that they might, I own, but not praise God *so* as you mean, but *so* as I mean, i. e. They might do it, *suppose they could better their State as to Happiness*, but we do not know they can do that, but it is a Duty and Condition to the Living to praise God, *pag. 9. Vind.* because we know they can better their Estate. This, *I think*, is the design of all those Scriptures.

Vit.

Vit. For you to *think* and me to *think*, I *think* is to no purpose without proof; and if you farther *think* that the reason of praising God ceases, to separate departed Souls, because they cannot by it better their *State of Happiness*, What do you *think* (seeing you are so thoughtful) of Angels in perfect Bliss, from whom God requires *Eternal Praise*? Rev. 4. 8. Chap. 5. 11, 12. And behold, I heard the Voice of many Angels round about the Throne, and the Beasts, and the Elders, and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands. Saying with a loud Voice, *Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive Power, and Riches, and Wisdom, and Strength, and Honour, and Glory, and Blessing.* And every Creature which is in Heaven, and in the Earth, and under the Earth, and such as are in the Sea, heard, &c. saying, *Blessing, Honour, &c. be to Him that sitteth on the Throne, and to the Lamb for ever.* Now why might not the Souls of Men if existing separate, so praise God, though they cannot better their *Estate of Happiness*? Sure I am, your reason for praise is very weak, you did mean, I guess, *prayer* to better our State and Condition in the next World. You had better have answered my Question: How do you know they do not praise God, as you did? How can you tell they have no Knowledge? pag. 8. *Vind.*

Subst. I know both *Praise* and *Prayer* too in this *Life*, are *Duties* which are required, and by them both we may better our future *State*.

Vit. And do not you know, that if they are a *Duty* in a *State* of *Conjunction*, they must be much more a *Duty* in a *State* of *Separation*? *Praise* being almost the sole business of the *Angels* in *Heaven*, as *vid.* *Revel.* of *St. John*, in several places—
Come, I'll put you in a way to answer *Eribius*, say, the *dead Bodies* cannot praise *God*, but their *living Immortal Souls* [perhaps] may.

Subst. Why? If I had said so, I do not know how you could answer it.

Vit. I could only have said, that then *Hezekiah's* thanksgiving for his *Life* had been vain, and his *Sollicitation* for it needless, in order to praise *God* as *He* did that day. *The Grave* cannot praise thee, *Death* cannot celebrate thee, &c. But the *Living*, the *Living*, he shall praise thee, as I do this day, *Isa.* 38. 18, 19. Because in a separate *State*, by his *living Soul*, he might have been able to do it with greater perfection, than when encumbered with the loads and infirmities of the *Flesh*.

Subst. But I agree with you that the Evidence of this matter is not so clear in the *Old Testament* as in the *New*. Yet however there are enough that conclude fairly and strongly enough to my purpose,

as

Subst.

as Gen. i. v. 20. God commanded the Waters to bring forth the Fowl that might fly above the Earth, and the Earth to bring forth Cattle, and the Beasts of the Field, *Vind. pag. 11.* When He comes to the Creation of Man, He turns his Phrase and speaks in a nobler way, let us make Man after our Image, v. 26. The manner of which, Moses adds, And the Lord God form'd Man out of the Dust of the Ground and breathed into his Nostrils the Breath of Life, so Man became a living Soul, *Vind. p. 12.* which is a fair Intimation at least of the Pre-eminence and Excellencies of Human Nature, which I cannot but think best accounted for by an *Immortal Soul.*

Vit. Indeed, Mr. *Substantivist*, I thought this Text so sufficiently answered by *Elphinstone*, pag. 264, 265, 266. of *Second Thoughts*, that you would have blush'd to have brought it over again, especially not fairly and by halves; for Gen. i. 20. It is said let the Waters bring forth abundantly every Creature that hath Life or Soul, as it is in the Margin, and so Life, vers. 30. is call'd *Living Soul.* How come you to conceal this Signification? Again, if God altered his way of speaking, and turns his Phrase, as you call it, doth that give Man an *Immortal Soul*, and not to Beasts the same? Where does that appear by the Text? What umbrage have you to call this *Breath of Life* an *Immortal Soul*, see-
ing

ing Beasts are said to have it also, *chap. 7. vers. 22.* and you may better account for Man's perfections without it. If God indeed had said, *Be the Beasts form'd of a Mortal Breath or Soul, and Man of an Immortal one,* the turning the Phrase and altering his Speech had been materially urg'd, but here I see no such alteration any more than that God spake appositely of the things He formed, and denoted Man's perfections to be according to his own Image, which undoubtedly He did do without creating in him a *Spiritual Substance*, as far at least as by this Text can possibly be made out.

Subst. Well then! What think you of that Text, *Eccles. 12. 7. Then shall the Dust return to the Earth as it was, and the Spirit [mind that word] to God that gave it,* *Vind. p. 13.* These give light to the words of *Moses*, attesting that they also were intended to declare the *Soul of Man* to be a distinct substance from his Body.

Vit. I think these words needed not to be cited to explain the words of *Moses*, *Gen. 2. 7.* for they are plain enough in themselves, nor do they manifestly declare a distinct Substance; but they suit best with the occasion and context, and make the Author speak consistently with himself, *Vind. pag. 13.* and to the purpose according as He had described the State of Man before, *Chap. 3. vers. 18, 19, 20, 21.* For it means no more, than that *Life* which God gives

us now, as soon as we die, Reverts, and Centers in God the Fountain of *Life*, else how can the Spirits of the *Wicked* [mind that Word] return to God, the Fountain of Purity and Holiness?

Subst. I could allow of this interpretation if it had been first prov'd *incontestibly*, that the Soul could not be a distinct Substance; for where the certainty of things are afore determined, we must be content with such senses of Scripture as will be suitable to them, *Vind. p. 15.*

Vit. If a thing be *incontestibly* prov'd, and *certainly afore determin'd*, you are content the Scriptures should speak suitable to them; very fine indeed! if any thing be certainly true, and determin'd so before hand, you will grant it true; Pray who will not? A rare Confession! And had you *incontestibly* proved from the Texts of *Moses*, that by it 'twas certainly determin'd, Man had a distinct *Substance*, I promise you I never would have question'd your Interpretation of this Text, but until then, pray make your Text explain how wicked Souls go to God.

Subst. Why? Returning to God doth not imply into *his Presence* or *Favour*, but into his *Hands* [Power] or *Disposal*; which infers no derogation to God's *Purity* or *Holiness*, *Vind. p. 16.*

Vit. No, it doth not, nor doth it come up to the sense of the Text, nor indeed explain any thing at all, much less the Obvious, and genuine Sense thereof. For if God *annihilates* your substantial *Spirit*, it is still in his *Power* to re-create it, and in his *Disposal* to re-implant it in the *Body* or not. If God causes it to *sleep* in the Grave until the Resurrection, it is in his *Power* and *Disposal* still. Nay, if God cause it to *transmigrate* from Man into Beast, or reside in the Concave of the Moon, it is still in his *Power* and *Disposal*, yet I hope you cannot call this a *Returning to God*. If you do, then certainly even the Beasts of the Field, and Fowls of the Air, may be said to *return to God*, when they die, because they are in his *Power* and *Disposal* to be reproduc'd when He pleases.

Subst. So, I find, you push home; but I told you there were not so clear Evidences against you in the *Old Testament*, as in the *New*; what think you of that Text, *Fear not them that can kill the Body, but are not able to kill the Soul, but rather fear Him that is able to destroy both Body and Soul in Hell*, Mat. 10. 28. *Vind.* pag. 17. I think this demonstratively proves a distinct *Substance*, call'd the *Soul*, though I agree with you, that in the general Design, the meaning of the Text is, not to fear Man, whose Malice could take away this *present Life*,

but cannot destroy the *Life in the next World*, but the Words are not so.

Vit. Nay, if you stick to the Words, pray tell me, what will fatten a lean *Soul*, or make lean a fat *Soul*; what will quench the drought of a *thirsty Soul*, or satisfy the appetite of an *hungry Soul*. For they are all call'd so, by the Words of the Scripture.

Subst. But you must conceive other interpretations of those Texts, than literal, for a Spirit is not capable of those Passions.

Vit. Nay, Sir, but stick to the Words, or give me leave to interpret according to your own Rules; whereof the *First* is, To examine well the Context and Occasion, *Vind.* p. 13. Secondly, To make all Divine Authors speak consistently with one another. Thirdly, Where the Truth and Certainty of things are incontestibly evident by other Arguments, there to make the Scripture to speak agreeable to the Truth of things, and to be content with such interpretations as that will bear, though less accountable to the sound of Words. But where the things themselves are unknown, and to be learned only from the Texts of Scriptures, there to be sure the most easy, plain, and obvious Interpretation is to be preferred, *Vind.* pag. 14.

Subst. Ay, come let us go on according to these Rules, and interpret as you please.

Vit. First, I examine the Context and Occasion. The Occasion of our Saviour's Discourse seems to be an Admonition to them, to strengthen them against Persecution for His sake, whereby they should lose their Lives, from vers. 16. to vers. 28. upon which account Brother should put Brother to death, vers. 21. And they should be hated of all men for his sake, v. 22. But He that was constant, and endured to the End should be saved, when the Son of Man should come, vers. 23. That their suffering would be no more than your Master himself suffered, v. 25. Fear not them therefore, vers. 26. But preach it on the house top publicly, vers. 27. For although the Malice of Men aim at you, vers. 28. Fear not them that can kill the Body, but are not able to kill the Soul, but rather fear him which is able to destroy, both Body and Soul in Hell.

Subst. You say right, and this undeniably declares a distinct Existence of the Soul after Death, pag. 17. *Vind.*

Vit. Not so undeniably neither; for it follows all along to denote the Providential care God had of the Lives of his Apostles, nay of Sparrows, vers. 30. and the hairs of your head, vers. 31. and so on to vers. 38. whereupon He concludes, That they shall have a future reward for their constancy, because, vers. 39. He that loseth his Life for my sake shall find it. Now I think here is the Occasion and Contexts sufficiently on my side, to denote the whole discourse

to relate to Life in this World, and the finding it in the next.

Subst. Well, But how did our Saviour speak consistently with himself, or other Divine Writers with themselves relating to this very point (which is my second General Rule of Interpretation) if by killing the *Soul*, they did not mean destroying the *Spiritual*, or *Immaterial Substance* of Man, and as it could not be destroy'd by Man, must therefore necessarily be Immortal.

Vit. Then, Mr. *Subsanimist*, I will show you how coherent our Saviour is, if we interpret the Word *ψυχή* Life, but here rendered *Soul* with himself, and also how consistent the expositions of two other Evangelists (the best Commentators on the Text can possibly be got) are with this Interpretation I give of it. *First*, Because our Saviour tells his Apostles in the close of his Discourse, *vers. 39. He that findeth his Life, shall lose it*; meaning hereby undoubtedly, he that for fear of persecution shall endeavour to save his Life in this World, shall lose Life everlasting: And this I take to be the Genuine Interpretation of *killing the Soul*, i. e. losing Life everlasting. So far then is it coherent with the beginning and ending of the whole Discourse. But, *Secondly*, If our Saviour had meant, they cannot *destroy* your *Spiritual Substance* or *Soul*, the Discourse would not be consistent in itself, because He tells them, *they had a Soul*, *vers. 29.*

vers. 29. *that could not be killed or destroyed*, but vers. 39. it might be lost or destroyed, as the word *perdere* in Latin, and *ἀπώρειν* in Greek both signifie, both in St. Mathew, St. Luke, Chap. 9. 24. St. John 12. 25. and is conjoyn'd with *ἵνα* in every place before mentioned.

Subst. But, Sir, by your leave you run on too fast, for *destroying* of this present Life relates to Man, in whose power it was to do it, but to *destroy* the *Soul* relates to God in whose Power alone (and not in Man's) it was to destroy it.

Vit. Here I think I have given you a very fair scope, and urged the Objection as strongly, as it is capable of being urged; but this wants a farther Explication yet, because it adheres too close to the literal sense of the word *killing* or *destroying*, which I supposed, I had sufficiently confuted, pag. 31. Now if *destroying* be interpreted *confounding* the Soul, by reducing it from a state of Life to either an annihilation (which is in the Power of God to do) or to a not-being the same formal Substance (which are the only two *modus's* of Destruction here applicable; for being an *Immortal Substance*, it cannot have Life separated from it so as to determinate it Dead, by separation of Life from it.) The sense of the Text will be rendered inexplicable. For neither this *present Life*, which is an essential Attribute, or Affection

fection of the *Soul* can be destroyed, any more than the future life, because it necessarily will accompany the *Soul* wherever it goes. And Man has not *Life* in this World but by the *Soul*, neither doth he lose *Life*, but by Separation of the *Soul* from the *Body*. Therefore whoever destroys this present *Life*, an essential attribute of the *Soul*, must, if only Man, destroy the *Soul* also, which is an absurdity too great to be granted by the strongest *Substantivism* in the World, *Proprietates sequuntur essentialiam* is a true Maxim in Philosophy, Reason and Religion, and he that can destroy them, may destroy the Essence or Being to which they belong; wherefore take St. John's best interpretation of the Text, with this little Paraphrase: *He that loveth his Life shall lose it, and he that hateth his Life in this World, shall keep it unto Life Eternal*, John 12. 25. So ye my Apostles, says our Saviour, if you fear Man, more than God, to preserve, what you ought to hate for my sake, ye shall lose it, for God will destroy both *Life and Body* in Hell.

Subst. Hey, Dey! *Life and Body*? Where do you find such a distinction in Scripture.

Vit. I find it distinguish'd, *Mat.* 6. 25, as it is here recited, pag. 23, but I do not insist upon it here for that very reason only, but because I presume I have satisfied

you according to the Rules of Interpretation before mention'd, that this ought to be the genuine construction of the Text, *Mat. 10. 28.*

Subst. You have puzzled the Text I confess, but you have not satisfied me, that hereby is not meant a Substance distinct from the *Body*; however let me see you reduce it to my Third Rule of Interpretation, which is this: Where the truth and certainty of things are incontestibly evident by other Arguments, there to make the Scripture speak agreeable to the Truth of things, *&c. vid. pag. 31.*

Vit. Here is a very easie parallel; for as the Concurrence of the Evangelists, and the Coherence of our Saviour's Discourse with it self, proved your Second Rule to square to my Interpretation, so, I presume, I have proved it *incontestibly evident by other Arguments*, that the literal meaning of this Text is not to be admitted, and therefore must be made to speak agreeable to the truth of things, and we must be content with such interpretations as the Text will bear, though less accountable to the sound of Words. And where the things themselves are unknown, as is the separate Existence of the Soul, and to be learned only from the Texts of Scripture, there the most obvious and easie interpretation is to be preferred, *Vind. pag. 14.* But if the Texts of Scriptures do not plainly instruct us, as this

this doth not, there another interpretation must be made.

Subst. I must own the sound of words in many places must not be followed, but here methinks you might let them go; for it is but supposing Man composed of Body and a spiritual Substance, and the Text is easily accounted for.

Vit. You say very right indeed, for you all along suppose it, and don't prove it. If from this Text it did necessarily and plainly follow, that it was a Substance, because, it might be cast into Hell with the Body, I should say you had a Demonstration indeed, but it neither infers *Substance*, nor *Immortality*.

Subst. No, but i'll prove it Syllogistically.

Whatever is capable of being cast into a place of Torment, must be a Substance.

But the Soul of Man is capable of being cast into a place of Torment, viz. Hell.

Therefore the Soul of Man must be a Substance.

Vit. Here I deny your Major Proposition, and very justly too, for you may as well argue thus:

Whatever is capable of being cast into the Fire, must be a Substance.

But Colours, or Qualities inherent in a subject are capable of being thrown into Fire. *Ergo.*

Thus

Thus you demonstratively see on what sandy Foundation your *incontestible Reasons*, your *undeniable Truths*, and fair *Intimations* are built on.

Subst. But if it cannot be killed, or destroyed, it must be Immortal.

Vit. No, I deny that also; for the Sun, Moon and Stars, are incapable of being destroyed, yet not Immortal, I hope, unless you have your *Platonick anima Mundi* to en-join them to all Eternity.

Subst. Oh! But that living *Substance* which cannot be destroyed, or killed, is Immortal.

Vit. That Proposition is true, but then join your Minor to it, viz. But the Soul of Man is that *Living Substance*.

Where are you now? You have been trying at this Proposition several times, but never did, nor ever yet will be able to prove, so let us go on.

Subst. Ay, with all my Soul: And what say you to that Text our Saviour quotes out of *Moses*, *God is the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; God is not a God of the Dead, but of the Living; for all Live unto him*, Luke 20. 37, 38. Now this supposes those *Persons* to be alive, and so living as to be capable of God's favour, i. e. living by the Immortality of the Soul, which survives the dead Body, and not totally Dead, as to Body and Soul too; which proves very clearly the

the distinct and separate Existence of an
Immortal Soul, *Vind.* p. 19.

Vit. I see you can say, as I say, that
Persons were alive, and capable of God's
Favour. Now if you will call *Persons*, the
Souls, because they are so call'd frequently
in Scripture, I'll dispute the point no lon-
ger; we are agreed, and only differ in
Words.

Subst. Not so neither; for I don't mean
Persons as it includes Body and Soul, but
only that their *Souls* surviv'd when their *Bod-
ies* were Dead, which clearly proves their
distinct and separate Existence.

Vit. Methinks you are very positive, nay
a bold Assertor; for where does the Text
imply or infer their living by the *Immorta-
lity* of their *Souls*? How doth the Text
prove they had such separate Self-existing
Souls, because God is a God of the Living?
And if not proved Existent, how can they
be *Immortal*? In reality, I find, that if I
deny your Existence of two such Substan-
ces, to make up Man, you can prove no-
thing at all.

Subst. Why? Their *Bodies* were Dead and
Buried, therefore it must be their *Souls*
which were in a state of Life or Living.

Vit. That is no necessary Consequence,
unless you had first proved them to consist
of such a Soul and Body, you mean; for
here you beg me to grant the Question,
and then bring Scripture to your own sense

to prove it, pag. 19. *Vind.* Therefore, Secondly, it must be the Persons of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who were living.

Subst. What? Then were they risen by an extraordinary Miracle from the Grave before a general Resurrection, *Vind.* pag. 21. This makes him feign an Antecedent Resurrection of some particular Persons before a day of Judgment.

Vit. Whatever is feigned, I will not determine, but I am sure your Assertion looks like a Fiction, to say, *They were actually alive in the other World by the Life of a spiritual Soul, Vind.* pag. 21. And yet cannot explain to us how its possible such a Soul should exist. But to give you my Reasons (not Demonstrations) for an Antecedent Resurrection of the Just, according to the purport of several Texts, I think it in this place necessary, because I presume I can give better Reasons for that, than you can possibly for the Existence of our Immaterial Substance.

Subst. Come, lets hear you prove it, and I'll say something.

Vit. If you say something to the purpose, more than you have, it's well. *First,* Therefore, if God be a God of Abraham, &c. and they living, they were raised by an Antecedent Resurrection. *Ergo.*

Subst. Those were their Immortal Souls that were living.

Vit.

Vit. Hold! observe your first Rule of Interpretation, pag. 31. to observe the Context and Occasion. Now the Occasion you tell me was, about a dispute between the Pharisees and Sadduces (though the Text says, between the Sadduces and our Saviour) concerning the Resurrection. The Resurrection? Of What! For *Souls* which could not possibly die, but were immortal, needed no Resurrection from the Dead, and our Saviour had made but an odd Preface to it. *Now that the Dead are raised,* Luke 20. 37. if he had meant their living again in their Souls; therefore this plainly seems to evidence Resurrection to mean an Antecedent Resurrection of the whole Man.

Secondly, If it be done by the Power of God, it is and may be done by the ordinary methods of Providence in relation to him, though not to us: For Miracles are only such in respect of Man, who is the judge of the impossibility of the things so done, to be done by any *Human Power*; now where such miraculous Operations cannot be *comprehended* by Man's Understanding, as being totally unknown to him, neither occur to his Senses, they cannot be call'd *miraculous*; therefore it is also reasonable to suppose, God has ordain'd for his Favourites a quicker transition to Heaven in his usual method. Because,

Thirdly,

*Thirdly, Our Saviour says, Father I will
 that those [Apostles and Disciples] whom
 thou hast given me, be with me, where I am
 not inferring it effected miraculously, but
 according to thy own continued usual act
 of Omnipotence] that they also may behold
 thy Glory, which thou hast given me, John 17.
 4. So as a Reward our Saviour says to his
 servants, Where I am there shall also my
 servant be, John 12. 26. Now here plain-
 ly seems to be a fix'd determination of his
 Will, to have his Servants with him in Glo-
 ry, without any miraculous Operation to
 procure it. And although I cannot say this
 Text confirms there Immediate Enjoyment
 of our Saviour in Glory, to be with him
 where he is, yet it is a greater Evidence,
 than any can possibly be prov'd for a di-
 stinct Immortal Substance, for an antecedent
 Resurrection of the Just, because other
 Texts are apparently coincident with these,
 and not one declares for the Resurrection
 of a Soul, which living again, though out
 of the Body, must import.*

*Subst. Have you any more Texts of Scri-
 pture, by which you endeavour to prove
 your Antecedent Resurrection of some just
 persons, I own it cannot be called a Resur-
 rection of the Soul, but methinks, though
 you have puzzled me, you have not yet
 cleared the point enough.*

Thirdly,

Vit.

Vit. How would you have me clear it? I tell you again that *Moses* died, and was buried in a valley of the Land of Moab, *Dent.* 34. 6. yet appeared unto our Saviour after he was so Dead and Buried, *Mat.* 17. v. 3. Now how is it possible but that he must be rais'd from the Dead by an Antecedent Resurrection? For his Soul could no more rise, than *Abraham's* did, there being no Resurrection to an *Immortal Being*.

Subst. No, why not! could not the Soul of *Elias*, and the Soul of *Moses* appear without his Body? Indeed *Elias* was wrapt up into Heaven, Body and Soul too, so there is a different reason for him more than *Moses* who was buried.

Vit. Your answer, I must tell you, is not to the purpose, because all along you cry, The Soul, as a distinct Substance, and never have proved it such. But pray answer me only this one Question; how came the *Immaterial Substance* of *Moses*, which all allow *Invisible*, to be seen by *John*, *James* and *Peter*? *Mat.* 17. 2, 3. Methinks I see you looking about to find the Cloak of an *Aerial Vehicle* to wrap him up in, to make him visible to *Human Eyes*. Such pitiful shifts of Philosophy are you forced to recur to, to make but a poor tolerable Covert for your *Immaterial Substance*, which any Sober Rational Man would blush to obtrude on the World.

Subst. This Notion of an *Antecedent Resurrection* being never yet spoke of, but by your self, you must give me leave to be very nice in enquiring into the Grounds of your Assertions for it. I know in *Abraham*, &c. and *Moses*, there must be an *Antecedent Resurrection*, before the General One, and that at our Saviour's Resurrection, *many Bodies of the Saints arose, and went into the Holy City, and were seen of many*, Mat. 27. 52, 53. But all these actions I look upon to be miraculous.

Vit. I will not call them *miraculous*, for the Reasons above mention'd, but as they are done to Persons on whom God is pleas'd to bestow extraordinary marks of his Favour, as you may read how pathetically, and with what concern our Saviour frequently speaks of his Disciples as his Friends; *those whom he has chosen, whom he has loved*, &c. I may call them the products of God's extraordinary Love towards such his Favourites, whom *He* condescends to exalt to Glory before a *General Resurrection*.

Subst. But, methinks, if God ever had intimated such a design of Pre-raising any one to Happiness *Personally*, some Declaration of his *Will* to that purpose would appear in the Holy Scriptures, whereby a fair intimation, if not a plain signification thereof, might be collected.

Vit. You say very right, and to me our Saviour seems to declare it to be his *Will*, or the necessary Product of his *Divine Omnipotent Nature*, not being limited at any time to exert it. For in his Discourse with *Martha* about her Brother *Lazarus*, John 11. 24. *I know* (says she) *my Brother shall rise again at the last Day*; nay, but says our Saviour, *I am the Resurrection and the Life*, vers. 25. And because *He* was so, immediately rais'd him from the Dead, as it were denying that his Power was only limited to that day, but exerted it self when *He* pleased, *That he that believeth in him, tho' Dead, may live*. Again our Saviour tells *St. Peter*, *Whither I go thou canst not follow me now, but thou shalt follow me afterwards*, John 13. 36. and if I go and prepare a place among the Heavenly Mansions of my Father for you, *I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also*, John 14. v. 2, 3. For because I live, ye shall live also, vers. 19. And Chap. 16. vers. 16. *A little while, and ye shall not see me; and again, a little while, and ye shall see me, because I go unto my Father*.

Subst. Well! Pray, what do you infer from all these Texts?

Vit. From the Examples, I think I demonstrate that there has been *Antecedent Resurrections* of very just Men, so that we need not the support of *Souls* to prove their present personal Existence in Bliss. From

the Texts appears Christ's general Commission to raise the Dead, *when, and as He pleases*, as being the *Resurrection and the Life*, and that He doth more signally declare it to be his *Will* to raise his Favourites, Apostles and Disciples to Glory, before other common Believers, whom *He* declares *He* will raise up at the last Day, John 6. vers. 39. 40. 44.

Subst. But heark you, Sir, will not the allowing them an happiness in their Souls *immediately* do as well, as raising up their Persons from the Dead to Bliss?

Vit. No, it will not, for you ha'n't the least ground imaginable for the Souls of either of them being in a separate State of Happiness, but meer Platonick Principles, you make the Foundation of your Belief.

Subst. But pray, Sir, how can you convince me, that any Man personally is raised from the Dead, seeing I can by ocular Demonstration convince you; that those very Flesh and Bones, which are a part of that Person, so raised, or pretended to be raised, lye in the Grave for many years after? How is it possible then that the *same* Person can be raised?

Vit. I thought *Estibius* had fully answered you this point, pag. 432. *&c.* of *Second Thoughts*, by telling and proving also from Scripture, that it was not requisite that the *same Numerical Body* be raised, but only the

Specific Body was sufficient to denominate Man the same. The Identity of Particles in such a flux State as Man lives in, being not in the least to be considered in relation to Reward or Punishment.

Subst. Then you think it sufficient, if Man be Raised with *Human Flesh*, though not the very *Individual Flesh*, with which he was Buried, bearing the same Qualities and Qualifications, though in greater perfection, than he had on Earth, that the same Man is properly raised; but this seems to me a new Creation of Man at the Resurrection.

Vit. Sir, It is not I think so by conjecture, but if I do not mistake, it is the very Doctrine of St. Paul, 1 Cor. 15. 37. *Thou sowest not that Body that shall be, but God giveth it a Body as it hath pleased him.* Now if God giveth a Body as He pleases, to the Grain sown, the parallel must be in such words as these, *Thou buriest not that Body which shall be, but God will give, that which thou buriest, a body as it pleaseth him; which the Apostle seems very plainly to intimate by enumerating the divers Species of Flesh in the very next Verse. All Flesh is not the same, but there is one kind of flesh of Men, another flesh of Beasts, another of Fishes, another of Birds, vers. 39. There are also Bodies Celestial, and Bodies Terrestrial, vers. 40. So that it seems evidently plain, that this our numerical Flesh and Bones will*
not,

not, nay cannot be the composition of our *Spiritualized Bodies*, which God will give us, at the day of the Resurrection: And that it can be no Creation as I prove, *pag. 66. Suppl.*

Subst. Let us go on to our other Texts, *This day thou shalt be with me in Paradise*, Luke 23. 43. Now this must certainly mean, the *Soul* of the *Thief*, for undoubtedly his *Body* was buried, as other *Bodies* were.

Vit. As the Scripture has not one single Syllable of this Man's rising with Christ, so neither doth it speak one word of his being Buried; therefore, pray tell me, how it doth appear that he was not *bodily* exalted to Glory with our Saviour? Though he might not be one of those that rose with our Saviour from the Dead, *Vind. pag. 25.*

Subst. What? another Miracle! Here you have recourse to a Miracle a second time without Authority or Reason, *Vind. pag. 25. L. 125.* For as our Saviour in the forementioned Texts relating to *Abraham, Isaac, &c.* declared himself so apparently in favour of the *Soul's Immortality*, that nothing can be plainer, so here he adapts his promise [to the Penitent Thief] to the capacity of those that heard it, *Lin. ult.*

Vit. Methinks you seem to have wrote in haste; for *First*, you tell us this dispute happen'd between the Sadduces and Pharisees, though the Texts tell you, it was between the Sadduces and our Saviour,

Secondly, You tell us that the Pharisees own-
ed an *Immortal Soul*, or *Spiritual Substance*
of and in Man, pag. 20. which exists in
life when the Body is dead; Pray did you
learn that from the Holy Scripture, or
some other Book? I am sure the Scriptures
testifie no such thing of them, but only that
they believed Angels and Spirits, Act. 23. 8.
and mention not one word of an *Immortal*
Spirit of Man. *Thirdly*, You make very
bold with our Saviour, to tell us, *That*
He apparently declared Himself in favour of
the Souls Immortality. Pray where is that
apparent Declaration? You find not the
least tittle of it in Scripture, and there he
only manifestly declares for a future Re-
surrection of the Dead, by the proof of
an Antecedent Resurrection of *Abraham*
and *Isaac*, &c. What can you make more
of it? Pray learn not to obtrude on any
one, much less our Saviour, a meaning ne-
ver intended.

Subst. Pray, Sir, away with your grave
reprimand. Don't you charge our Saviour
with Folly, in saying, *Thou* to the Thief
on the Cross, when as his *Soul* could only
be meant by it, and *He* spake according
to the capacity of the Hearers, before whom
He promis'd him Happiness. Is it not usu-
al in all Languages to put the whole for a
part, and a part for the whole, and more
especially, that *so essential and constituent a*
part, as the *Soul* is? Shall a dead Carcase
be

be call'd as a Person, and not the *Immortal Soul* be spoken of in the same Language.

pag. 24.

Vit. Very fine indeed! Tell me but one single instance in the World, where *Thou* is apply'd to a part only, and you do your Work. You say, indeed, it is apply'd to God and Man in our Saviour, and you confess you know but that one Instance in all the World, pag. 24. Now the Mystical Union of the God-head in Man is the object of our *Faith*, and as such, we verily believe God compos'd of two Natures, bearing different Relations, upon which account we give different compellations also, one in relation to the God-head, and another in relation to the Man-hood. But now what can we make of our Saviour himself in relation to his third Nature, *viz.* the *Immortal Soul* belonging to his Man-hood? What compellation can be given him, tho' He had these three Natures, any other than *Thou*, personally meaning the *whole Man*, as Living and in all appearance like other Men? I am well assur'd, that you would in any other case ridicule any Man, that should apply *Thou* to the half of any thing whatever; and here to recur to the greatest Mystery of our Religion, to explain the possibility of its being rightly apply'd to a part, shows you are very much put to it to defend the Speech of our Saviour to a part of the Man for the whole. As for

your calling the Soul that *essential and constituent Part of Man*, when it is proved to be a Part, then your Rhetorick will pass for an Argument, and a dead Carcase, call'd *per catachresin*, a dead Man, and will justly deserve the Title of *Thou*, tho' but one half of the Man.

Subst. Well! But what say you to that thundring Text in the *Thessalonians*, Cap. 5. v. 23. *I pray God, your whole Spirit, Soul and Body, may be preserved blameless until the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.* Are not Soul and Spirit here mention'd as two things entirely distinct?

Vit. I grant you, But where are the distinct Substances? The Will and Understanding are distinct Powers of Living Man, yet not immaterial Substances; 'tis that you must prove the Soul to be, or nothing, by the words *Spirit and Soul* here meant. But I thought *Estibius* had so fully answered this point according to Dr. *Hammond's* own Exposition, that you would not any more have insisted on any other Explanation thereof, viz. That God would preserve the Spiritual and Carnal Man (as it is *Rom. 8. 5, 6, 7.*) *blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

Subst. But what think you of that desire of St. Paul, *To depart, and to be with Christ*, *Phil. 1. v. 23.* If he thought he must lye in the Grave perhaps Ten Thousand Years before he was with Christ, he would rather
desired

desired to have lived, though under Persecution, to Preach the Gospel to others, and for their sakes have coveted rather to abide in the Flesh, *Vind. pag. 27.* Now if we suppose, St. Paul after the Death of the Body, had his Soul by the Power, and Merit of Christ made Easie, and Quiet in Joy and Peace, the answer is plain; and he had had a speedy recompence for his Labour and Pains, *ibid.* But if he was to lye 10000 years before he receiv'd his Reward in the Grave, as I just now said, where would be the speedy Recompence?

Vit. I find you know St. Paul's mind very well, though you seem to tell me rather, what your own mind would be in that case, than what his ought to be. He desired to die, and be with Christ, by which means his Persecutions would be over, and he would enjoy Happiness; and a very good wish it was, but the Text says no more than that it was his *desire*, though you require me to *suppose* his Soul by the Power and Merit of Christ made Easie and Quiet in Joy, else you cannot well explain the Text. But why should I suppose that which doth not so appear by the Text? I rather suppose him one of Heavens Favourites, and so rais'd by an Antecedent Resurrection to Glory; but if he is not, he has no injury done him, if his request be not fulfilled until the *Resurrection*. For in the ordinary course of Providence, Man

(not

(not the Soul of Man, as you falsely quote *Estibius*) will not live until the day of the *Resurrection*.

Subst. Where have you any proof from Scripture for that Doctrine? Don't you believe the *Souls* of Men live immediately after they are separated from the *Body*?

Vit. No, indeed don't I. Nor any wife Man can, till you have proved us to have such *Spiritual Substances* separable from us. But as to my Proofs, take first that of *Job*, *There is hope of a Tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, &c.* But *Man dyeth, and wasteth away; yea, Man giveth up the Ghost, and where is he? As the Waters fall from the Sea, and the Flood decayeth and dryeth up; so Man lyeth down and riseth not till the Heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep, Chap. 14. v. 7. 10, 11, 12.* Is not this a plain Text, that Man will never live again, until the *Resurrection*, though you make him live in his *Soul* immediately after *Death*?

Subst. All these are only Poetical Phrases in lofty Style, declaring that *Death* would put a final end to all his *Sufferings*, *Vind. pag. 31.*

Vit. What if they are lofty Phrases, are they not therefore Truth? What a strange answer is this? Read the *Prophets* and you'll find abundance of lofty Phrases, and *St. Paul*, *1 Cor. 15.* quotes their own very *Poets* against the *Corinthians*, which cer-
tainly

ainly are in no way the less evidences of truth, because in lofty Style! Good Mr. Substanimist answer better, or not at all: for this very Reason, I'll pass over all the other Texts cited from *Job*, least you should tell me his lofty Style may exclude truth.

Subst. Come let us hear your other Texts which you prove Man, to lye in a State of *Insensibility* in the *Grave* until the *Resurrection*; you harp so much upon lofty Style, that we can now hear nothing from you but ridicule, or some self-conceited ———

Vit. Hold! Hold! Mr. *Substanimist*, I'll tell you what the *Royal Preacher* says. *That which befalleth the Sons of Men, befalleth beasts, even one thing befalleth them: As the one dieth, so dieth the other, they have all one Breath, so that a Man hath no preminence above a Beast, All go to one place, all are of the Dust, and all turn to Dust again.* Ecclef. 3. v. 19, 20.

Subst. Here he must be allowed to speak other Men's Sentiments, and not his own, *Vind.* p. 33. or else unavoidable consequences too intelligious to be granted, will follow many Texts of the *Royal Preacher*.

Vit. Truly, Mr. *Substanimist*, this is almost like the answer of your lofty Style. You had as good as tell us, the Preacher collected several good Rules of Divinity and Morality, but never delivered them as his own, so that you may believe his Book, or

or not as you please. Here he plainly asserts the same End to *Man* and *Beast*, as being ignorant of a *Resurrection*, which the *Jews* were. And undoubtedly they would have totally perish'd like each other, as far as our knowledge could reach to the contrary, had not the Gospel reveal'd to us the Doctrine of a future *Resurrection* to *Man*. Now as we by it learn that we shall rise again, so the time by it is limited to the last Day, John 6. 39. 40. Therefore *Man* shall lye in the Grave untill that Day.

Subst. Ay, you quote, Ezek. 18. 20. The *Soul* that sinned, it shall die; you had better let that Text alone, seeing you own *Soul* to signifie *Person* in that very place, as it doth in several others, and includes the whole *Man*.

Vit. And doth not *Person* include the whole *Man*?

Subst. Yes, I know it doth, but then it doth not include a total death of *Body* and *Soul* too, but this is a begging the Question, and not proving it; such Tropes and Expressions are very common in all Languages, *Vind. pag. 33.*

Vit. Stay a little, and not too fast, pray, What is *Body* and *Soul* unired, but the *Person* of a *Man*? Now if *Man's Person* die, doth that which made up that *Person* die and Perish? Note, That this Argument I urge to you, because I doubt you are a weak *Sophister*, but I don't rely upon it as

any

any at all. But again, The third Argument to prove Men dies totally until the Resurrection is drawn from the Parable of the Tares, Mat. 13. v. 27. The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a Man which sowed good Seed in his Field; but while Men slept, his Enemy came, and sowed Tares among the Wheat, and went his way. But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth Fruit, then appeared the Tares also; so the Servants of the House came, and said unto him, didst not thou sow good Seed in the Field? From whence then hath it Tares? He said unto them, an Enemy hath done this. The Servants said unto him, wilt thou then that we go, and gather them up; but he said, nay, least while ye gather up the Tares, ye root up also the Wheat with them. Let both grow together unto the Harvest, and in the time of Harvest, I will say unto the Reapers; gather ye together first the Tares, and bind them in Bundles to burn them, but gather the Wheat into my Barn, vers. 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30.

Subst. What do you conclude from all this?

Vit. Take the whole, as explain'd by our Saviour himself, and then I'll tell you what I infer from it. The Field is the World, the good Seed, the Children of the Kingdom, the Tares the Wicked, the Enemy, the Devil, the Harvest, the end of the World, the Reapers the Angels, &c. vers. 37, 38, 39.

Subst.

Subst. All that is intended by this, God doth not sever the Wicked from the Just in this Life, because he has determin'd that to be the Business of the Judgment in the next, *Vind. pag. 33.*

Vit. A notable short answer indeed; but according to your Notion of *Human Soul* you go to work to separate them, *viz.* Just from the Wicked, before the Harvest, i. e. end of the World. For no sooner a Man dies, but ye assign his *Soul* to *Heaven*, if *Good*; or if *Wicked*, to *Hell*, at least to some place of present *Happiness* or *Misery*. Pray what right have you to anticipate God's peculiar Work which *He* has reserv'd to be done at the end of the World, when as at a prefix'd time, *He will separate the Goats from the Sheep*? You say well, that this is the meaning of the Text, to let the Wicked and Just live together promiscuously, and not sever the one from the other, but then there is more intended, than you mention. For it must of necessity relate to all time Antecedent to the Harvest, the end of the World, as well to them that are in the Grave, where the Small and Great, the Oppressor, and Prisoners rest together *Job 3. 19.* as to those that are then actually alive. For why should you invade the Prerogative of God Almighty, by making a Separation before hand, and consignment as it were of Men's Souls, to immediate *Salvation* or *Damnation*? These Texts are

to very plain a proof of the Just and Un-
just lying undistinguish'd, and unseparated
in the Grave, until the great *Harvest* at
the *Resurrection*, that even a School-boy
must so understand them.

Subst. We don't make that Separation of
Men's Souls, but God doth it, *He* has or-
dain'd it shall be so.

Vit. Take heed how you charge God
with Folly, as you must do, if you make
such a Separation before his own prefixed
and determinate Time; and although you
take no notice of it, yet I must tell you,
that Argument bears weight taken from
St. Jude v. 6. And the Angels which kept
not their first Estate, but left their own Ha-
bitation, He hath reserv'd in Everlasting
Chains under Darknes unto the Judgment of
the Great Day. Now if *Spirits Convict* are
reserv'd to Judgment, how dare you pro-
nounce a *Pre-condemnation* to Sinners in their
Souls, though but to lesser Punishment, be-
fore the Judgment of that *Great Day*? Sure
I am, how frivolous soever you may look
upon these Arguments, they every one seem
to me to bear great weight, and none but
a Man of a prejudic'd Education can pos-
sibly in my Opinion evade the force of yours.
But as you tell me, *pag. 34. Esfibi* is
doubly *unfortunate*, and so indeed, *He* is.
First, That *He* endeavours at a Miracle
without a *Divine Power*, viz. to open the
Eyes of Men willfully Blind; and *Second*.
That

That He attempts to convince *Ignorant Zealots*, or if not *Ignorant*, such *Zealots*, as answer the Character of Bishop *Bowyer*, and think Fire and Faggot the best way of illuminating the Understanding of any one they will call Heretical, if his Arguments seem too knotty to be resolv'd. But God forgive them, and their Passionate Unchristian Zeal.

PART II.

Subst. **W**ELL, Mr. *Vitanimist*, I don't doubt but that you have seen your Error, but in this second I will set you in as clear light in all these matters, as I am able, by which I hope you will become a Convert, *Vind. p. 35.*

Vit. I will be very attentive, if you proceed without Passion, so pray answer me this Argument.

What was to have been Immortal in a State of Innocence, became Mortal by Transgression.

But whole Man was to have been Immortal in a State of Innocence. *Ergo.*

Whole Man [Body and Soul, especially the principal sinning part the Soul] became Mortal by Transgression.

How do you make good that Immortality of that *Soul*, you have devis'd? Supposing it were that distinct Substance of Man, you *pretend* to, and I can never grant, because you see such invincible difficulties necessarily attend that Notion.

F

Subst.

Subst. This Argument is very easily answered, because your first Proposition is a meer *Fallacy*; and *False*, or *True* according to the Notions Men form to themselves of *Death*; for if *Death* be a Separation of *Soul* and *Body*, your Argument is not good. Because the Man may be said to die whenever *Soul* and *Body* Separates, though the *Soul* continue in *Life* still, pag. 36.

Vit. Hey, Day! Then I must grant you *Death* to be a Separation of the *Soul* from the *Body*, or else all is but *Petitio Principii*, & *gratis Dictum*. But pray what reason have I to do it, seeing it is the main point of the Controversie? Yet for Argument-sake, I'll grant it you for once, and argue with you *ad hominem* (as they say) upon your own Principles. So pray tell me the falsity of the first Proposition?

Subst. Why, Man sinned, and not *Soul* or *Body*, and as Man sinned, he became *Mortal*, i. e. his *Soul* became liable to be separated from his *Body*, which otherwise would have continued immortal with his *Body* in a state of Innocence.

Vit. Nicely distinguish'd indeed! But—*Vind.* pag. 37. if neither *Soul* or *Body* sinned even *Adam* himself sinned not, for *Adam* cannot be distinguish'd from himself, viz. *Soul* and *Body*, the essential parts of his Composition.

Subst. This is but a fallacy still; for *Soul* and *Body* sinned in *Adam*, but the sin was

not imputed separately to either, but to *Adam*, as a *Living Creature*, whose *Soul* suffers by *Death*, p. 37. as well as the *Body*; and the *Man* that sinned, without *Repentance* is liable to *Damnation*.

Vit. You said as much as this came to before, but still this makes *Adam* a distinct thing from himself, on essential parts, which you have not in the least answered. Besides, pray tell me what doth the *Soul* suffer by its *Separation*? Nine parts in ten of the *Divines* of the *Church of England*, allow the *Body* to be but a clog to the *Soul*, and that in its state of *Separation* it acts with greater perfection abundantly.

Subst. All that is but *gratis dictum*; you may as well say, that the *Body* of a *Man* is more active for the loss of both *Hands* and *Feet*, because he is rid of much clog and weight. For if God has so formed the *Soul* and *Body* of *Man*, though of different parts, as to have their perfection of felicity only when united, it is to no purpose to argue from the Nature of the Things considered apart, *Ind. pag. 38.*

Vit. This is a dead-doing resolution of the Case, but I blush for you. Every Notice in Philosophy will tell you, *That an integral part can never be a burthen to the whole, of which it is a part*, though it add weight to the whole when put into the Scales. No *Man* is, or can be weary of his *Legs* or *Arms*, but they themselves as

parts of the whole, may be weary and tired. So pray lets have no more of this. How comes it not to be *gratis dictum* & *Partitio Principii* in you, as you frequently charge on *Estibius*, to say, *If God has so formed the Body and Soul of Man, as to have their perfection of felicity only when united.* &c. for I find you take it for granted, that God has so formed Man, and assert it as true as the Gospel. Pray forbear such positive Assertions too, and give me some proof thereof in your next Edition.

Subst. But, Sir, have you considered, that *close Union*, that *intimate Union*, that is between *Soul* and *Body*, p. 39, 40. more than that of a Tortoise to his Shell, or Fly to Paper. I must tell you, that you have no clear notions of its Union.

Vit. I do consider the *close Union* of both but pray how close would you have me to imagine them to stick together? I fancy they are as close united as Water and Wine, will that do? Or to stick as close as two polished Marbles.

Subst. No, no, Water and Wine is the best comparison and comes nearest, though not up to the point. For Wine being Spirituous, may actuate Water, and invigorate it, like a *Soul* the *Body*.

Vit. But, Sir, by your leave, Wine and Water are two material Substances, whose particles I can conceive so to be intermixed and united, as that neither can be distinguished

guishable by the Eye, or Taste, so close is that Union. But pray, tell me how I shall conceive the particles of a material *Body* united to an *Immaterial Substance*, which has no particles at all.

Subst. Come, let these Metaphysical Niceties alone; you and I agree in some points, viz. That the *Body* which was dissolv'd into *Dust*, shall return again into its former Substance and Likeness at the *Resurrection*, and what before had neither *Life* or *Sense*, shall have *Life*, and perform all proper *Vital Actions*, p. 40. But this *Life*, I allow the *Body*, by the intimate Union of the *Soul*, and you do not.

Vit. It is very true, I do not allow it to proceed from an *Immaterial Substance* of Man call'd *Soul*, because you never did, nor ever are able to prove the Existence of that *Immaterial Substance*, whereas the Existence of *Life* is demonstrably evident to the meanest capacity.

Subst. But then you tell us, That the Existence of an *Immortal Soul*, going immediately after Death to *Heaven* or *Hell*, makes a general Judgment unnecessary. Because (say you) if my *Soul* be in *Heaven*, I have my ultimate; if in *Hell*, my ultimate punishment; and consequently there is no need of a General day of Judgment, *Vind.* p. 40.

Vit. And are not both those Propositions true?

Subst. Yes; But why may not God have one end of letting Man have a foretast of Joy or Misery, and another end of a General Account? Does not the former become a Comfort to the Good, and a Torment to the Wicked? And yet will it not be much for God's Honour to reserve the completing of their Joy, or Misery to a more solemn Account, in the circumstances of which he will be more eminently Glorified, *Vind.* p. 40. for my part, I believe this is a full and satisfactory answer to any reasonable Man.

Vit. If you are satisfied in the truth of your Assertion, pray give me leave to be so too, for I cannot; because, *First*, *Why may not God*, &c. is a Question you ought to prove positively from Scripture, That God has two such ends and purposes of his Divine Will, and not come with a *why may not*. Why may not there be as many Worlds as stars in the Heavens? Why may not there be a World in the Center of the Earth? And a thousand such Questions may be put, but still they make no proof at all. But *Secondly*, I cannot affirm that God doth give us a foretast of Joy, or Misery in our Souls, because the Holy Scriptures mention a *prefiguring* day for the day of Judgment and Glorification, according to the ordinary Methods of his Providence, and generally express it with the particule *Then*, as *Mat.* 13. 43. *cap.* 24. 30. *Mark.* 13. 26, 27. *1 Thes.* 4. 17. &c. *Tho*

Tho' that day no Man knoweth, Mat. 13. 36.
 Now where God has prefix'd a Time, or Day, as the Scripture calls it, I see no reason I have to antedate that day of Glorification, or Condemnation, which he has already determin'd. *Thirdly*, Because it is inconsistent with infinite Justice to punish any Man, though but with initial Torments, as they are call'd, before his Examination, *John 7. 17.* as thus I prove,

Infinite Justice prejudges no Man to Torment without Examination of his Crimes.

But if God condemns the *Soul*, though but to small Torments before the General Judgment, he prejudges Man to Condemnation before Examination of his Crimes. *Ergo*, it is inconsistent with infinite Justice.

If these three Reasons convince you not, your *Immaterial Substance* is capable of no Impression from Reason or Religion.

Subst. Come let us wave this Argument, and talk a little of the *Repository of Souls*, which I confess is a tender point and nice; and therefore whatever my own Sentiments are, I would not be too Dogmatical or Positive with others, *Vind. p. 42.*

Vit. Why is this so nice a point? I see no reason for it, but only because if you don't grant it, you cannot tell how to explain the Introduction of the Soul of Man into the Body at his Generation without a Miracle. And you must suppose God at every Generation to create a new Soul without this Repository.

Subst. Prethee let this point alone, I tell you, all you alledge from the *Resurrection* amounts to nothing. It neither makes any difficulty in the thing, nor any thing unaccountable in the Reasons of it, pag. 42. But let us try your last Argument drawn from the Redemption, where you have mistaken the cause, or not took the proper method in defending it.

Vit. Hold! You said just now, you would not be too Dogmatical or Positive, let the Reader judge whether it amounts to nothing or no. And if *Eslibius* has mistaken his method of defending his Cause, I will try if I can amend it. No Man may argue so cautiously in every point, as not to lapse sometimes. The Argument is this—

That which fell by Transgression, requir'd by Christ's Blood, Redemption; but whole Man fell by Transgression, Ergo, whole Man requir'd Redemption.

Subst. Well, what if it did? What if whole Man requir'd Redemption? Is this to the purpose? You were to have proved hereby that Man *had no Soul*; instead of that, you prove the whole Man required Redemption. I grant the Body of Man requir'd to be rais'd from the Grave, and the Soul to be united to the Body, which Union is that which compleats Man, and so it makes him capable of greater Bliss or Torment, p. 43.

Vit.

Vit. Boldly asserted on my word! Now pray prove what you so assert, and I shall consent, I fear you mistook *Estibius* his Argument; for he lays it down as an undoubted and *incontestible* Truth, that a *Spiritual Substance cannot die*. Now the *Medium* he assumes to prove Man has no such *Spiritual Substance*, is because whole Man died, *i. e.* Body and Soul must die, seeing whole Man required Redemption. And to show that it proves what he designs, I will reduce it into a Syllogistical form for your better apprehending the force of the Argument.

No Spiritual Being can die, but is Immortal.

But the Spiritual Being in *Adam* must die, if he had any such Being.

Ergo, *Adam* had no such Spiritual Being.

Now here you see, how I lead you on to prove my Minor Proposition, as thus:

That Being must first die, that required Redemption; but the Soul of *Adam* required Redemption, as well as his Body (I mean the whole Man) *Ergo*, the Soul must die.

Subst. All this proves nothing yet, and I say, as in a State of Innocence *Man* had continued Immortal, so in a State of Sin, *Man* dies by a Separation of the Soul from the Body. By which both the constituent parts suffer, viz. The Body by Dissolution, and the Soul by Surviving in that State of Separation, to endure what a Righteous God shall think fit to inflict, *Vind. p. 43.*

Vit.

Subst. Prethee let this point alone, I tell you, all you alledge from the *Resurrection* amounts to nothing. It neither makes any difficulty in the thing, nor any thing unaccountable in the Reasons of it, pag. 42. But let us try your last Argument drawn from the Redemption, where you have mistaken the cause, or not took the proper method in defending it.

Vit. Hold! You said just now, you would not be too Dogmatical or Positive, let the Reader judge whether it amounts to nothing or no. And if *Estibius* has mistaken his method of defending his Cause, I will try if I can amend it. No Man may argue so cautiously in every point, as not to lapse sometimes. The Argument is this—

That which fell by Transgression, requir'd by Christ's Blood, Redemption; but whole Man fell by Transgression, *Ergo*, whole Man requir'd Redemption.

Subst. Well, what if it did? What if whole Man requir'd Redemption? Is this to the purpose? You were to have proved hereby that Man *had no Soul*; instead of that, you prove the whole Man required Redemption. I grant the Body of Man requir'd to be rais'd from the Grave, and the Soul to be united to the Body, which Union is that which compleats Man, and so it makes him capable of greater Bliss or Torment, p. 43.

Vit.

Vit. Boldly asserted on my word! Now pray prove what you so assert, and I shall consent, I fear you mistook *Estibius* his Argument; for he lays it down as an undoubted and *incontestible* Truth, *that a Spiritual Substance cannot die.* Now the *Medium* he assumes to prove Man has no such *Spiritual Substance*, is because whole Man died, *i. e.* Body and Soul must die, seeing whole Man required Redemption. And to show that it proves what he designs, I will reduce it into a Syllogistical form for your better apprehending the force of the Argument.

No Spiritual Being can die, but is Immortal.

But the Spiritual Being in *Adam* must die, if he had any such Being.

Ergo, *Adam* had no such Spiritual Being.

Now here you see, how I lead you on to prove my Minor Proposition, as thus:

That Being must first die, that required Redemption; but the Soul of *Adam* required Redemption, as well as his Body (I mean the whole Man) *Ergo*, the Soul must die.

Subst. All this proves nothing yet, and I say, as in a State of Innocence *Man* had continued Immortal, so in a State of Sin, *Man* dies by a Separation of the Soul from the Body. By which both the constituent parts suffer, viz. The Body by Dissolution, and the Soul by Surviving in that State of Separation, to endure what a Righteous God shall think fit to inflict, *Vind. p. 43.*

Vit.

Vit. I find you still harp on your Notion of Death, as you did before, and will have it still a *Separation of the Soul from the Body*, so there is no end of Dispute, if you will have it so, and I must grant it. Therefore let another be judge of the Reason of your demand; but methinks you make a pretty sort of a punishment for the sinning Soul, viz. a *Surviving in a State of Separation*; pray what sort of punishment can this enjoyment of an *Immortal Life* be, seeing you tell us, pag. 44. That the loss of *Immortality* is doubtless a punishment, and an effect of Vengeance? What doth the Soul, one of Man's constituent Parts, suffer in the Rent from the Body, as I may call it, at the point of Death, seeing it is an *Immaterial Substance*, as I before Argued. Lastly, What would you suffer, if you were the last Liver, by Survivorship in the late *Act of Parliament*? Good, Sir, find out some other Punishment for a Soul that sinned, or erase this Notion out of your Book.

Subst. Pray, Sir, look to your own Notion, and trouble not your head with mine, let me hear you prove your Major Proposition, of the Syllogism you just now propos'd. For as to the Minor, I agree, *Adam* as he consisted of Soul and Body, both required Redemption from the Guilt and Punishment due to sin, but an *Immortal Being* may require Redemption, as well as a *Mortal*.

Vit. That I grant you by the way of arguing must follow, because the Soul (which *Nolens Volens* you will have to be an *Immortal Substance*) may sin, and then it will require Redemption from its Guilt, *vid. Rom. 3. 24. Col. 1. v. 14. Eph. 1. v. 7. i. e. forgiveness of the sin*; but let me tell you, sin presently makes your *Immortal Being* become *Mortal*. And then the Punishment of that sinful Being necessarily follows, *viz.* Death, either *Temporal*, or *Eternal* or *Both*. From which Punishment our Saviour Redeems us, *1 Thes. 1. 10. Heb. 9. 12. Luke 21. 28.* thus *Adam* would have been *Immortal*, but he sinned, so became *Mortal*, from the Guilt of which, and *Eternal Punishment*, Christ redeemed us in him. This I hope is a sufficient answer without reducing of it into a *Syllogistical Form*.

Subst. But according to this Gentleman's Notion, there are several disadvantages to Christianity more than he perhaps is apprehensive of, besides the difficulties from the Texts above mention'd, *pag. 44.*

Vit. Pray what are they? For as to your Texts I don't find but they are sufficiently answered, but you have a way with you, as they say, you run on with two or three Objections, and think you have carried the day, but never mind those weighty Objections he brings against you.

Subst. Yes, but I do, but they are so light and trivial, all but these last, that I thought it

it not worth while to insist long on them. But now you shall see what grand difficulties, never to be solv'd, arise from this Gentleman's Opinion, as

First, That God had not upon Man's fall provided Sufficient and Adequate Punishment for the actual Transgressions, and Vices, and contemptuous Affronts of Wicked Men, pag. 44. l. 15.

Vit. This is an horrid thing indeed, a momentous difficulty, and I doubt they are all such. How this follows from the Doctrine of the Non-existence of a substantial Soul, I don't well apprehend as yet, perhaps I may by and by. So put it thus, *If the Soul be not a Spiritual Substance, then God has not provided sufficient and Adequate Punishment for the actual Sins of Men.* Is not this a rare consequence? In troth I don't like it so far, but I hope in some other difficulty I shall meet the Philosopher, as well as the Divine, making good and true Inferences, and not so wide from the matter.

Subst. Why, don't it necessarily follow, That Man would die like a Beast, if our Saviour had not redeem'd him? Nay, would have been in a worse State, whilst he liv'd in Sin, because he would have run through many Afflictions, that a Beast cannot be capable of. And God would inflict no more on sinful Man, than on a Beast which cannot Sin, viz. Death, which is against distributive Justice, pag. 44. lin. ult.

Vit.

Vit. I suppose you would take it very uncivilly, if I should desire you to reduce your Argument into a Syllogism or two; for it runs so huddling, that I can scarce comprehend it. However, pray take this in Answer, that before Man's fall, he was in a State of Innocence, so God had not, nor indeed needed, provide any Punishment at all, much less a Sufficient, and *Adequate* as you call it. But as soon as Man sinned, he then provided Sufficient and *Adequate Punishment* for him, the Woman and the Serpent, *vid.* Gen. 3. by denouncing a curse, not only against them, but even the very Ground, *v.* 18. which was as Innocent undoubtedly, as any Beast can be, of the Transgression. This is the Punishment God was pleas'd to inflict on *Adam* for his original Sin, and on us in him; which in *Adam* was an actual Sin, for which he was so punished by God, without any regard had, as we read, to Eternal Torments in Hell, since more fully reveal'd to us by the Gospel. Now if this Punishment was not Sufficient, and *Adequate* (though God I believe thought so) pray what hurt is it to say, *God had not provided Sufficient and Adequate Punishment for the actual Sins of Men, until he provided Eternal Damnation.* Is it absurd, or against Christianity? But if God had, or had not provided Sufficient and *Adequate Punishment* for our actual Sins, would it not be the same thing one way as the other, if Man
be

be punish'd, or his Soul punish'd for actual Transgressions?

Subst. No, it's not the same thing, for according to this Gentleman's Notions, Man would die like a Beast, and the greatest sinner would have no more Punishment than a Beast, viz. Death. For he that shall never have any Life but upon this present Stage, can have no other Punishment than Temporal Afflictions, which are not an *Adequate Punishment* for actual Transgressions. And he———*Vind.* p. 45.

Vit. Hold, Sir, a little, you run on too fast, you'll be out of Breath presently, you rumble so much in *Adequate and Sufficient Punishment*. The whole stress of what you would say is this ———

What has no Being after Death could have no Punishment. But fall'n Man according to this Gentleman's Notion, had no Being at all, Ergo, no Punishment. And consequently God had not provided Sufficient and Adequate Punishment for actual Sinners; this I presume is the Summary of the whole.

Subst. Yes it is, and pray, your Answer to it, if you can. Is not this an invincible difficulty?

Vit. No, I think not, for I deny your Minor Proposition; for fall'n Man, according to *Estibius's* Notion, would have had a Being at the Resurrection, and not perish'd like a Beast as you say, *Vind.* p. 46. For He tells you in several places, *That Man will*

will be quick'ned at the Resurrection, and not totally perish. But what if he had said, Man would have perish'd like a Beast, you could not have call'd it a false Doctrine, unless you had had recourse to a Resurrection; for how came you, or any one else to know that Man would not totally have perish'd, and never have reviv'd, but from the Revelation of a future Resurrection? Nay, to go farther, How came you to form a Resurrection to Life, as the living in our Souls immediately after Death seems to import, without Divine Inspiration? In short, all this Harangue about *Sufficient and Adequate Punishment* for actual Transgressions, seems nothing to the purpose to the Existence, or Non-Existence of an *Immaterial Substance* call'd Soul. For that God, when he punish'd Adam, did it with regard to a future Judgment, which should afterwards be by Jesus Christ, and that the Punishment of Hell-torments was ordain'd by the Divine Fore-knowledge and Will of the Creator, I presume is the concurrent Opinion of most of the Divines in the World, although He inflicted on him then only Temporal Punishment. So now let us canvass the second Difficulty in relation to the Redemption of Man.

Subst. Come then; I say, this Notion [of the Souls Non-Existence] much derogates from the necessity of our Redemption and Goodness of God in it, *Vind. p. Vit.*

Vit. Pray how does that appear?

Subst. I find you mistake me, I do not say the Non-Existence of our *Immaterial Substance*, call'd our *Soul*, but the Notion this Gentleman has of Man's fall, derogates much from the necessity of our Redemption, and Goodness of God in it.

Vit. Why, I thought we had controverted the Non-existence of *Human Soul*, as a Self-subsistent Being.

Subst. So we do, but I must carry on the clue of my Argument, to make it appear by this Author's Notion of Man's Fall, that he scarce leaves him under any Misery at all, for what has no Being can have no Misery. And this Author cannot suppose any future State for Man without Redemption, and consequently no real Misery to be redeem'd from, *Vind.* pag. 47.

Vit. Good, Mr. *Substantivist*, I think you have urg'd this point already, only changing the word *Misery* for *Punishment*, so a short answer will do, *viz.* That which has no actual Being *now*, may have, and will have a Being at the Day of Judgment, which will require to be redeem'd from the Wrath of God by the Merits of Christ Jesus. And he that is then found Righteous, will have the blessing of everlasting Life thorough Christ, which, as you say, is a singular Act of Grace and Compassion, *pag.* 47.

Subst.

Subst. I don't say, he brings our Redemption to nothing, but it is less consistent with the unparallell'd Love and Pity which are declared to have been the principles of it, than ours. For let *Mankind by Death be suppos'd under Misery by the Souls Surviving*, and then we all of us without Redemption must inevitably continue in such a state for ever, *Vind. p. 48.* So how great is the Love of God towards us, to redeem us out of such a State, which is nullified by your Notion of Man's dying totally untill the Resurrection, *Vind. p. 48.*

Vit. Let *Mankind Survive in Torments untill the Resurrection*; You say mighty well, but that *Let* of yours I think cannot be granted. For it is just, as suppose I break my Leg, it is an Act of Love and Compassion to cure, especially *Gratis*: But I must beg Mr. Surgeon's Pardon, if I can, I will rather keep my Leg whole and sound, than permit it to be broke willingly to gain his Love and Compassion in the Cure. Therefore prove matter of Fact of your pre-existing Torment to a Sinners Soul, before a *General Judgment*, and I'll then subscribe to your Opinion; and so I will to your second disadvantage, you pretend arises from our Redemption.

Subst. Why don't you think it derogates much from the advantages and consolation of our Redemption? *pag 48.* and that

it equals the disadvantages of our Redemption to the Advantages, pag. 49.

Vit. What! the not having an *Immaterial Substance* in us call'd Soul? No, not in the last; you run on as if Man was to die like a Beast, and never revive, which is a great mistake, and is not *Estibius's* Opinion or Doctrine. Truly, Sir, I think it not materially urg'd to the purpose, and so I will leave it; as presuming it doth in no wise relate to the Controversie, but if it do, you must urge it in plainer terms and proofs than you have here set down, so let's go on.

Subst. But pray, How do you answer the third grand Difficulty, about Man's rising the *same Man* at the Resurrection? For in the *Soul's Identity*, it is secured beyond all dispute, that the *same Man* rises from the Dead, though as to his *flux State* in his Bodily Composition, he cannot be said to be raised again the *same*, *Vind. p. 49.*

Vit. How comes *Identity of Soul* to make the *same Man*? We have all *Identity of Life*, yet are not the *same persons*, so that Soul can no more make a Man the *same*, than Life can. If we had a transmigration of the *Souls* (as it is not impossible for God to permit it), which you will call the *chief of the two constituent parts of Man* in spite of Fate, pag. 50. would that Man be the *same Man* in 50 different Bodies by reason of his *Identity of Soul*? certainly, no, my Friend,

friend, no. No more than if it should Transmigrate into a Beast, and claim to be denominated the *same Man*, because he possesses the *same Soul*.

Subst. Your Arguments are only Suppositions of Matters which we are assured never did or will happen in fact, though it is possible they may happen, pag. 51.

Vit. Nay, what is possible, according to you, may happen in fact; for it is possible that two Men may have the same Qualities, Qualifications and Likeness, yet not be the same. But if we agree in the *Identity of Soul* (say you) it is such an help to this difficulty, as in reason ought not to be given up, whereas the difficulty is wonderfully increas'd by the entire dissolution of the Soul, *Vind. p. 51.*

Subst. And are not you of the same Opinion too, That this difficulty is almost insuperable to explain how that *same Man* will rise again at the Resurrection, if we part with the *Identity of Soul*!

Vit. No indeed, Mr. *Substantivist*, it infers not the least difficulty on the Resurrection, to say Man will be distinguish'd by his Qualities and Qualifications from another, as he shall be rais'd a corporeal *Living Creature* again. But your Notion of *Identity of Soul*, must of necessity puzzle us ten times as much, unless you can assign what distinguishing characteristic one Spirit (as you call Souls) has from another.

ther. What Criterion have you to distinguish the dissimilitude of two *Immaterial Beings*; so as to denote them Identically different? That which usually distinguishes Man from Man are his Shape, or Figure, Qualities and Qualifications, according to the old Philosophical Maxim, *a Qualitate oritur Similitudo & Dissimilitudo*; now if you can assure me, that the *Separate Souls* have different Shapes, Qualities and Qualifications, so as they may by any nice Judge, or second-sighted Man (as they are call'd who can see Souls) be easily distinguish'd, I shall like well your tale for Diversion, but must beg your Pardon, if I disapprove your Argument. For although Angels undoubtedly are identically different, and cognoscible so to Human Eyes, when they appear, as *Moses* and *Elias* were, yet the foundation of that dissimilitude, whereby *Moses* was not *Elias*, nor *Elias* *Moses*, I take not to be their immateriality, but the representation of the visible qualities Each had, when living, to the corporal Organs of the Apostles, which can never happen to *Separate Existing*, and *Invisible* (as they are call'd) Souls, or Spiritual Substances of Men.

Subst. I find all your design is to puzzle us in finding out a *Modus* how one *Separate Soul* may be known distinguishable from another, but I hope, though we may be ignorant of that *Modus*; yet you cannot deny

deny but that numbers of Individual Souls are identically different from each other.

Vit. But why should you *hope* so? You beg the Question in Controversie, and *hope* I will grant it, but show me no Reason why I should. For if I granted *Separate Existing Souls*, I must necessarily grant them to be *identically different*, which is never to be allow'd. For a Soul that has nothing in it to distinguish it from another in a *Separate State*, cannot stamp the impression, as it were, or give the denomination of *Sameness*, or Identity to Man in the Resurrection. Because the Soul of any other Man, may re-inform the material lump of Earth, risen from the Grave, and yet the Man be every way *apparently* the same. Wherefore if Man rise not with the same Qualities and Qualifications, tho' in much greater perfection, *Identity of Soul* can never denominate him to be the same Man.

Subst. What! then, you think *Identity of Body* must be the only requisite to make up *Identity of Man*? *Vind. p. 51.*

Vit. Yes, I do, and a *Specific Identity* is sufficient, not a *Numerical*, as to all the particles Man's Body was compounded of, when he died. Where by the by, do not mistake me as if I excluded a *Numerical Difference*, for what are *specifically* the same must be *Numerically Different*; nor do I take *Body* as a part of *Man* contradistinct

to his Soul, but for a *Living Man*, when I apply it to Man, *vid. pag. 44.* of this Supplement.

Subst. What? You think then that our *Bodies* will be raised up from the Dead at the Resurrection, with such Spiritual Qualities and Qualifications, as may be the true Criterion to distinguish one Man from another, without recurring to an Identity of Soul! according to the Metaphysical Axion, *Quod est principium individuationis, est principium etiam distinctionis ab alio.* That which denominates Man the same, gives him something to distinguish him from another Man.

Subst. Yes, I do, and believe it to be true according to the Doctrine of St. Paul, and I presume consonant to the meaning of the Holy Scriptures, and to imply no difficulty at all for us to conceive or comprehend.

Subst. Truly, Sir, I think your Notion doth imply very great difficulties. For although God may form Man, and Woman out of the Dust anew at the Resurrection, and prepare them for a new Life in the other World, yet this is Creation, and not a Resurrection, *Vind. p. 51.*

Vit. Nay, that I absolutely deny, for Creation is making a thing out of nothing, as the World was: But Man was form'd out of a Subject Matter, *viz.* Dust of the Earth, upon which account you may call it

it a *New Formation* of Man, if you please, but not a *Creation*, which is the very plain notion of a *Resurrection*. *As in Adam all died, so in Christ shall all be made alive,* 1 Cor. 15. 22.

Subst. But you assert an entire dissolution of the Soul which must be re-created, *Vind.* p. 51.

Vit. No, but I do not, nor so much as mention it, but as *argumentum ad homines*, as we say, to confute Philosophers that their Notion of an Incorruptible Immaterial Substance could not be true, because according to their very Principles, it could not be incorruptible. This I told you once before, but you put me to Repetition, because you urge the same thing over and over again sometimes.

Subst. But there is another great difficulty, you can never get over, i. e. it subverts one of our Fundamental Articles of Faith, viz. Christ's Descent into Hell, which was to converse with the Spirits that were in Prison, being the Souls of Men deceased, 1 Pet. 3. 19.

Vit. This Text is oft quoted to prove a Purgatory, and is so by the Papists interpreted. Now if you dissent from Dr. Hammond and Grotius, in your interpretation thereof, pray give me leave to tell you what I mean by Christ's Descent into Hell, and do presume my Interpretation is more conform to Christianity than yours.

Subst. Come lets hear it; you are mighty good at Interpretations of Scripture, when it makes for your Advantage.

Vit. Indeed, Mr. *Substanimist*, I apprehend it to signifie no more than that our Saviour went into the Grave, or suffered Death like other Men, and was Buried; which must still be an Article of Faith in my Sense, as much as in yours. For as Christ was *God and Man*, it is as unconceivable, and above our Reason to comprehend how the God-head could be buried in the Grave (call'd Hell oft in Scripture) as it is to conceive how it could suffer Death. Thus says *Isaiab*, *Hell enlargeth her self, and openeth her Mouth without measure. And their Glory, and their Multitude, and their Pomp, and He that rejoyleth shall descend into it, Chap. 5. 14.*

Subst. I have one Objection more, to which I desire your answer, *viz.* That the prospect of Punishment being delay'd till the Resurrection, will mightily encourage Men in Wickedness, which they would not be, if they were told their Souls should be damn'd as soon as they die, *pag. 57.*

Vit. I thought *Estibius* had sufficiently answered you, and any reasonable Man in that point, when as it is so demonstratively plain, that there is no measure of time to the Dead. It will be but as a Minute to Judgment, and a Thousand Years not so much as one Day, *pag. 60.* So that if wicked

ed Men have a wrong Notion of Eternal Torments, you would do well by preaching to set them right, and tell them, that although the Evil Day be put off in their vain Imaginations, yet to them that long while they imagine, is but a Moment after they are Dead. For they will have no sense of any Interval, as the Living have when their Punishment is delay'd several years, but will be as it were immediately snatch'd to Judgment. Besides, if this delay of Punishment till the Resurrection be pleaded as Argument for sin, it will be so only by Reprobate and Hardned Sinners, whom no Terror of a future Judgment will Affright, as common Experience testifies. Therefore if such a Reprieve be a Countenance to Sin, it is only to them, who are resolv'd to Sin on maugre all Terrors whatever. So upon the whole, I desire you, notwithstanding your profession of Divinity, to take care to show more skill in it, than as yet you have discovered, pag. 64.

Subst. But heark you, Sir, there are two things you forgot. *First*, That you like the success of a thing by cozenage amongst ignorant Heads and rustick Understandings. For my part, I disdain and disclaim it all, that is not able to stand firm upon the plain principles of Truth, pag. 41.

Vit. I find you are mighty angry at this expression, but I think, without Reason. For to be plain with you, I think all Arguments

arguments drawn from false Principles, tho' they perswade and convince often, is but a Cozenage of the Understandings of Men, and undoubtedly lawful enough. If I can convert a Man to Christianity by giving of him Trifles, and Trinkets (which a poor ignorant Heathen perhaps admires) and promising him far greater and better, if he will but embrace the *Christian Faith*. Pray, what hurt is it? Yet it is a plain Cozenage of the Understanding, and I doubt not, but lawful and innocent. If Expressions make you rant so high, Pray what think you of St. Paul, 2 Cor. 12. 18. *Being crafty, I caught you with Guile, in Latine, dolo, with Deceit.* Do you think the Apostle used tricks to cajole the *Corinthians* to love him? &c.

Subst. No, I don't, but methinks you finely cajole us, when you tell us in the next place, That your Notion is a Demonstrative conviction that there can be no such thing as *Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, Prayers for the Dead*. This is just like denying the Authority of the whole Scriptures, to avoid the Obligation of keeping the Jewish Law; or like the rejecting the whole Gospel of the New One, rather than let the Pope have the Interpretation thereof, with two likes more, when we can an easier way *demonstratively* convince them. For but take away this Supposition of the *changeableness of the State of the Dead*, as to

Hap-

Happiness, or Misery, and the Influence of Prayers of the Living for them, and the Fire of Purgatory is totally put out, *Vind.* pag. 58, 59.

Vit. An Excellent way on my Word to put out a Fire! For as it is a *suppos'd Fire*, take but away the Supposition, and the Fire is quite out immediately. But what if a Papist cannot, nay will not let you take away that *Supposition*, of the Changeableness of the State of the Dead, no more than you will let me take away your *Supposition*, that Death is a Separation of the Soul, or Immaterial Substance from the Body; What will you do then?

Subst. No, but he can't deny that *No-*tion of Death.

Vit. Nor, says he, can you his *Supposition* of the Changeableness of the State of the Souls after Death, and if you (says he) insist upon the one, I will insist upon the other.

Subst. But he must give me good Reasons from the Holy Scriptures to convince me, which I am sure, he cannot: But I can for the Separation, and Re-union of Body and Soul.

Vit. Nay, If the Papist can give no better Reasons for his Opinion, than you can for yours of the Separation, and Re-union of Soul and Body, I am sure neither of them can signify any thing, put them both in the Balance and they will weigh just nothing.

thing. But grant it, says he, that deceased Souls are in an unchangeable State, yet may *Invoke* them and *Pray* to them, notwithstanding the Immutability of their State, if you urge no other Reasons against my so doing.

Subst. Yes, that you may, but yet it is still Superstitious, and not according to Scripture.

Vit. There I readily consent to you, but now you see mine is a better Supposition than yours to convince a Papist. For you have put but out one Fire, *viz.* that of Purgatory, and did not see two more that were ready to burn your Fingers. Now if *Life be the Soul* of Man, as it is frequently so call'd in Scripture, and also in our Liturgy, as its express'd in the Thanksgiving Prayer for deliverance from the Plague—*has delivered our Souls from Death.*

Then it is a Demonstration beyond dispute against Popery, for that we all agree has no Separate Existence after Death.

Subst. Then I agree with you, if Life, and Soul were always the same thing, but that is not so always, the Soul having a Separate state of Existence, as soon as departed from the Body, which State is unchangeable, be it in Happiness or Misery.

Vit. Say you so, then I doubt *Estibius's* former Argument concludes very strongly against you. If the Souls of the Just are in

in Heaven, and the Souls of the Wicked in Hell, where is the necessity of a future Judgment, seeing the State of both is unchangeable?

Snuff. Pugh! I have answered that already.

Vit. You have indeed said something to me, but not answered it. And where you are pinch'd a little, you generally come off with a Reflection, and nothing else; however all your Reflections I patiently pass by, and commend your Zeal, but blame your Discretion. 'Tis your Function that has excused you, for which I have a great Veneration, that I do not make a Retaliation in the same kind, for assure your self, if I find any Scurrilous Writer, worthy of my Indignation, I can quickly prepare a Rod for the back of such a Fool, and scourge him into common Sense and good Manners. For it is not that I am afraid of a Scurrilous Writer, but that I look upon such Treatment, not only Undecent, but Unchristian, and a mark only that such an unpolish'd Conversation could never reach above that of Draymen and Porters, to give him a fair Education to his entirely belov'd Company.——As for those that talk, and throw Base, Scandalous and unworthy Reflections on me, for a Confutation, I take it to be an Argument of the weakness of their Cause, as well as their Understanding; for Reflections may provoke a Man

Man into a fix'd Obstinacy, but can never
work a Conviction. So farewell, and the
God of Peace be with you.

Subst. But, hold Sir, pray, What say
you to *serious Thoughts on second Thoughts?*

Vit. In troth, Sir, it is such a Compens-
dious Rapsody of Scraps of Learning with-
out Reason, or Argumentation, that it is
not worthy taking notice of, only the Man
has discovered his Education by the Libel
he has affix'd thereunto, *Usur'd in by* *one*
of our most Principal Bishops of the Church
particularly naming the Lord Bishop of Lon-
don, to be as it were the Midwife to his
Scandalous Libel, or else it had never been
brought into the World. As if he had
committed Murder in a Popish Country
and fled to the Sanctuary for Protection
of his Villany.

Subst. Well, but answer him in some part
however.

Vit. No, I will not foul my Fingers
he is too mean a Prey. A poor inconfide-
rable Corrector of the Press, who was re-
jected by a Printer, which I know, because
he well understood not how to amend Le-
teral Faults, or to judge of Words rightly
conjoyned, so as to make them true Eng-
lish, or affix Points aright. This Doughty
Learned Hero, so well vers'd in Scul-
rility, who owns himself to have been an
Atheist, and to show his Modesty, that
too much Learning prompted him so to be
No

Now as the Fool said in his heart there was no God, so I leave him still to be the same Fool I found him, but do hope that in time he will prove a sincere *Changling*.

Subst. Well, if you will not meddle with him, what think you of that Treatise call'd, *An Antidote against Infidelity*.

Vit. Why I think it is a very pretty *Delamiation*, full of nice *Witticisms*, and quaint *Reflections*; only the Gentleman is unfortunate in his Writing against the *Soul-Sleepers* and the *Souls sleeping with the Body until the Resurrection*, pag. 10. as an *Old Heresy*, pag. 12. meaning it an Answer to *Second Thoughts*, who treats not one word of the *Souls sleeping*, but directly the contrary, *vid. Pref.* pag. 11. But to make us amends, his Title assure us, That the *Belief of the Souls Existence, separate from the Body, is the object of Faith*, and consequently *above the reach of our Reason*, so that we must be *Infidels*, if we believe it not, and our Creed ought to have a new Article, if he were our *Spiritual Supreme Guide and Governour*.

Subst. Why so! there are many things in Scripture which we do Believe, and ought so to do, yet are not comprehended in our Creed, as the *Creation of the World*, the *Formation of Man out of the Dust*, &c.

Vit. You say very right; but yet the Belief even of those, and all other passages in the *Holy Scriptures* may justly be said

to depend on the first Article of our Creed, and as he is the God of Truth, and cannot lye, so we ought to believe all things revealed from him by *Divine Inspiration* to be true. But such a Belief as this doth not supersede our Reason, but is Co-incident with it, as all the *Mysterious* parts of our Religion are not; now if by his *Antidote against Infidelity*, he intends to cure us of disbelieving the *Mysterious Union* of Soul and Body, as purely the object of our Faith, together with its *separate Existence*, and *Immortal State* after Separation. Why need we further controvert the Matter? All is at an End; show me but his Divine Authority, that an *Immaterial Substance*, call'd Soul, so united to, and separable from the Body, must be an Article of Faith, and I'll contend no farther.

Subst. You shall see, that he will prove it as plain from Scripture, that Man consists of an *Immaterial Substance* and Body, as ever any thing could be prov'd from Scripture yet.

Vit. Let me but see that, and I'll quickly shake of this *Heretical Opinion*, as you call it, although to me your Opinion, and not mine, seems *Heretical*, as *Herefy* is defin'd to be an Opinion not consonant to the *Orthodox Faith*.

Subst. Hey day! That's a turn I could not have expected.

Vit. Such a turn it is that you shall see by and by, that I will prove it, if I can be heard unprejudiced, upon better grounds than you can the *Seperate Existence of the Soul*.

Subst. You may prove it perhaps according to a Philosophical Querk, and Definition of your own, but from Divinity I am sure it is impossible; for in Divinity we are guided by an infallible Rule, the Holy Scriptures, in all matters of Faith, and so we cannot Err; and we don't lean upon the Opinions of different Sectaries, and various sentiments of Commentators, pag. 16. *lin ult.*

Vit. Don't you lean upon Commentators, and Expositors? Pray tell me then, How came you above all Mankind to quote them so frequently in defence of your Opinion, which you say (but bring no proof) is as old as *Adam's Transgression*, and taught by God *Almighty himself*, pag. 18. Have you the Divine Spirit of Interpretation of Scripture, that you need not Commentators or Expositors? Good, Sir, give me leave to tell you, that without Commentators and Expositors, Men that have been diligent and studious to search into the Sense of the Scriptures, some places thereof cannot be understood; now if I reject the Fathers and Councils; and you the Expositors, we must pray for Divine Inspiration to understand the Scriptures.

H

Subst.

Subst. Methinks you seem to lay an Emphasis on my Words, opinion taught by God Almighty himself; I tell you it was as old as the beginning of the World. For Man being Created in the likeness of God, it must necessarily follow, That *that* likeness consisted in the Spiritual, Intellectual, Immortal Nature of the Soul, and the Holy rectitude of its Faculties, pag. 22. as soon as Man was created, Gen. i. 26, 27. Chap. 2. 7.

Vit. Sir, I find you are a very positive Gentleman, to say God taught us [that lesson of the Souls Immortality] and that it's as old as the beginning of the World, and bring no better proof for it, than barely from the likeness to God in which Man was created; which likeness you must and do own, and so doth every Body I have met with, to consist in the perfection of his Nature above every Creature Else, viz. His Understanding, Will and Affections. Now whether Adam had not this perfection of Nature, I think need not be put as a Question, but I am sure, if to be like God, he meant, by the similitude of having a Spiritual Substance in him, you must first reject the Exposition relating to the perfection of Human Nature, and also pronounce Man but to be half-like God, and not wholly, as you seem to infer from the Text. Again, Pray don't you think God made Adam a Living Creature, without giving

giving him a *Spiritual likeness* to himself? The Text certainly concludes so, for God created *Man*, in his own Image, and not the Soul of *Man*, so that considering we cannot call it a Corporeal likeness to God, we must undoubtedly conclude it a likeness of the perfection of *Human Nature*. Therefore this Argument doth in no wise manifestly prove your Assertion, *vid.* pag. 62. *Suppl.*

Subst. But God breathed into Man the Breath of Life, which manifestly proves the Original of the Soul of Man different from the Body, the latter being produc'd out of the Dust of the Ground; as out of a subject Matter; but the former was created by God to actuate and inform the Body, which God had prepared for it, pag. 23.

Vit. Now don't you think you have *demonstratively* made it appear, that this *Breath of Life* was a Substance. Sure, Sir, you cannot be so little a Philosopher, or a Man of so little Reason to believe it; you may as well say, that whoever gives motion to a Globe, superadds a Substance; for Life is such to a Living Creature.

Subst. Well, but what say you to *Eccles.* 12. 7.

Vit. That is so fully answered already, that I say just nothing at all to it.

Subst. But don't you impose upon the World to make *Seneca* the Inventor of this Notion and *Plato* too, whereas there are several hundred years difference in their Times of Living? *pag. 27.*

Vit. Whether I impose upon the World, let the Reader judge, I am sure you do, to say the Doctor makes *Seneca* the Inventor of the Notion of present Rewards, and Punishments for separate Souls, or *Plato* either. For the words are, *pag. 47. S. Th.*—'tis certainly much to be admired that *Seneca* by the meer *Light of Nature* should comprehend [not invent] such a Notion of the Soul. But if he did not, it was the Doctrine of all the Platonists. —

Now certainly a Man may invent, suppose a Clock, but another must be the Man *must comprehend* its Movements, and if Nations before either *Plato*, or *Seneca*, all Heathens, invented the Notion of an *Immaterial Substance*, call'd *Human Soul*, as it appears *Chap. 10. of Second Thoughts*, that they did, neither *Plato*, nor *Seneca* were the first Inventors of the Opinion, but both of them might after they had *comprehended* it, cultivate the Notion, and add new perfections to the Spiritual Being, they so much admired. So pray take care you charge the Doctor falsely no more; for your *Souls-sleeping*, and this are two gross Errors you have invented. and not He.

Subst.

Subst. But you say *Seneca* might have it from reading the Bible, *Ecclef.* 12. 7.

Vit. So I do, that probably the *Aegyptians* might have it from the Books of *Moses*, Chap. 10. *Second Thoughts*. But I give it only as a probable Conjecture, and not urge it as an Argument to depend on, because they might misconstrue the Books of *Moses*, as might *Seneca* make false Deductions from that of *Ecclef.* This is no uncommon thing to do, as you see plainly by these inferences you charge on the Doctor's Writings.

Subst. Come, Sir, let us go on. You say that the Souls separate Existence after Death is incredible, because not duly represented to our Understanding and Senses. To which, I urge, That the Happiness or Misery of departed Souls, is not so compleat and perfect in the intermediate State between Death and Judgment as it will be afterwards. And that the Soul sleeps not in a State of Insensibility, as appears by the Parable of *Lazarus* and *Dives*, pag. 35.

Vit. Pray, Sir, go drink a little Coffee, for indeed you do urge me to say what I would not, by your *Soul's sleeping in a State of Insensibility*, and then quote *Lazarus* and *Dives*, which another would call the *Persons* of each, seeing not one word of *Soul* is mention'd in the whole Parable. Again, you tell us of the *Intermediate State*

H 3

of

of the Souls, but pray how, or where doth it appear in Scripture (the Touch-stone of Truth, as you say) that there is any such Intermediate State, where you keep the Souls in half-pay !

Subst. Why, Sir, there is such a state, I don't doubt.

Vit. But to say *there is*, and not prove it favours more of *Dogmatizing and Censoriousness*, than of unprejudiced Inquisition after Truth, pag. 37. For there is not only a total Separation of the Soul from the Body, as in Death, but also a *Partial Separation*, as in Dreams, Swoonings, Epilepsies, and the like *Absentings* of the Soul, pag. 16.

Vit. This is very fine indeed, a new thought ! I doubt your Soul *absented* her self a little while, when you wrote this ; let me a little *aurem vellere*, whither doth the Soul go when she *absents* her self ? How comes the Body to revive without a Miracle, seeing if the Soul be *absent* it must be dead ? If a Man be absent from a place, when summon'd to appear, we look upon it impossible that he can have any Influence there or Command, or pay Obedience, or do any action to testify his presence ; How then can your absented *Immaterial Substance* do it ? Yours is certainly that *Absential Presence* *Estibius* speaks of, pag. 71. *Second Thoughts*, and even so let it go.

Subst.

Subst. In the name of Goodness! What proof would you have of the *Souls Immortality*? Would you have it made appear to your Senses? Will nothing but *Mathematical Demonstrations* convince you? pag. 42. Do all those noble Operations of the *Soul* proceed from no higher a principle than *Matter and Motion*, pag. 43.

Vit. Where the things in debate are such as concern my *Salvation*, I think I ought to have very good proof of their being true, and well warranted from Scripture. I see no reason why any Man, of what Profession soever, has any right, or pre-eminence over me, so as to hinder me into the enquiring after the right means of *Salvation*. If I am a Physician, and think it Scandalous (as you say) to my Profession to go to Funerals, pag. 45. yet I hope, I may pretend to have Schollarship enough to search the Scriptures, and try by them, if I have not been bred in an Erroneous Doctrine. Now the proof that I require is only such as they can give me, and not *Mathematical* or *Ocular Demonstration*. Then as to *Matter and Motion*, You, I fear, do not consider the Power of them; all the greatest things in the World in *Vegetation*, *Generation*, &c. are done by *Matter and Motion*, they are the very Instruments of God Almighty's Power, in working either by Secondary Causes, or by Miraculous Productions in all the visible World. It is to

me the only *Demonstration*, I will not say, but a very great one against any Atheist to press him with the many and stupendous Effects of *Matter and Motion*, which by their various unconceivable ways of Operating, can argue nothing but the *Finger of God* to be their first Cause, or Original.

Subst. So then, your Soul is, only, like *Motion to Matter, Power inherent in Matter*, which sleeps with it until the *Resurrection*, pag. 46.

Vit. I do say, it is a *Power inherent in Matter*, but not one word of *its sleeping until the Resurrection*. I protest, if I did not think you sat up late, when you wrote this Treatise, I should quarrel at your frequent Repetition, of the *Soul's-Sleeping*.

Subst. If it don't Sleep, yet it must be a stupendous piece of folly in you to imagine that Matter is capable of such Speculations as the Soul is, or that the *inflam'd particles of the Blood*, which you call the active principles of Life, Motion, Sense and Understanding in Man, and Beast, is capable of Ratiocination, pag. 49.

Vit. What a false Charge again? I do aver, that he says not that the *Inflam'd Particles*, &c. though you speak it for him. This, Mr. *Substanimist*, is not fair; for his Position is, That God has made Man able to Think, and Ratiocinate, by the *Power*,
not

not Substance, he has implanted in him; as he has made Beasts, in an inferiour Degree, by the Power implanted in them. Now if you question God Almighty's Power, to be able to make living Man Ratiocinate, &c. without infusing into him a Spiritual Substance, then I have done, *vid.* pag. 155. *Second Thoughts.* And if the Instruments of such Cogitation, Ratiocination, &c. be the *Animal Spirits* (as Sennertus insinuates, seeing they are the most Quick, Active, and Vigorous principles of Motion, that we can conceive to be in our Bodies,) I see no reason why it should be thought impossible for Man by them to produce such noble Operations, as he doth. We all agree that Brutes do their Actions by them, and why therefore should not Man, though he acts in a greater Sphere of Perfection? For as to Men themselves, we see Perfection makes no *specific* difference, though one Man be almost an Ideot, and the other extraordinary Wise, yet one is as much Man as the other.

Subst. Grant it be the *Animal Spirits*, because we cannot conceive in *Matter* a better foundation of Thought, or Ratiocination, yet still they are *Matter*, and *Matter* can't think.

Vit. No, What think you of Brutes? Does their Soul, as all acknowledge Material, think? Good, Sir, leave trifling.

Subst.

Subst. I am sure you trifle to say *Life and Soul* are the same thing in Scripture, pag. 51. 53.

Vit. You will go on in spite of fire in false Charges against the Doctor, without Limitation or Distinction; and tell the World, that in general, he calls *Life and Soul the same thing*, whereas he plainly tells you, pag. 276. l. 9. and pag. 124. lin. ult. That is so only in relation to *Man's Composition*. Serve me such a trick again in false Quotations, and I'll be upon you.——

Subst. I confess, the Soul being us'd for the Spring of bodily Life, may be us'd for Life it self in Man, pag. 54.

Vit. I require a proof, such as the Nature of the thing will bear, to convince me that the *Soul is the Spring of bodily Life*, you think it very hard in me to be positive and dogmatical, but I find you take the liberty very frequently.

Subst. But I don't plague you with *Reiteration of so many odd things*, as you do your Reader, pag. 56.

Vit. No! then pray compare, pag. 23. with pag. 62. and pag. 57. with pag. 65. pag. 22. with pag. 99. pag. 85. with pag. 98. and several other places about the *Reiteration of the Soul's-Sleeping*, not being at all to the purpose. And because you oft charge me of being *Positive and Dogmatical*, I have just now given you an example of your *Positiveness*, so pray what think

think you of another, pag. 57. *The Material or Sensitive Soul is the Bond of Union of the Rational with the Body.* Bravely said! I do suppose you would have us believe your *Ligature* of Soul and Body to be so, because you say so. Pray first confute *E-ssentials* who proves the sensitive Soul cannot be different from the five Senses, pag. 168. and then your Bond of Union may be allow'd perhaps; but when you come and obtrude on us a *Bond*, whose *Existence* we must *suppose*, and an *Union* by that *Bond*, which we can never Imagine or conceive as to the *Modus*, how a material Soul (for it is still Matter) can unite a material Body and an immaterial Soul; you do in a manner bid us discard our Senses, and blind our Understanding, and then guess what you would be at. Come I'll be as positive as you for once, and tell you, that your Texts, not already answered, brought pag. 47. are frivolous, and beneath your Dignity to urge them. —

Subst. I find you are more Philosophically given, than to hearken to the plain Texts of Scripture; if *St. Paul*, 2 Cor. 12. says, *He knew not whether in the Body, or out of the Body*, it plainly supposeth the Soul capable of acting and subsisting out of the Body, pag. 58.

Vit. I should have been asham'd to have urg'd such a consequence from the Text; it being only a Testimony of his Divine rapture

rapture, wherein he was in such an Extasie, that he knew not where or what he was, during the time of his Rapture. You had better call it one of your *absentings* of the Soul for a time, as pag. 37.

Subst. So perhaps it was.

Vit. But then his Body must be dead for a time, or *half the Soul*, as it were, left behind to keep it in *partial Life*, ib.

Subst. Come, I don't enquire into the *Modus* of it. But you knowing the Arguments from Thinking, Volition, &c. to be unswerable, and such Acts not producible by *Matter and Motion*, or *material Man*, as you call him, pag. 60. must give up this second point in Relation; for I gain'd the first point, viz. that *Life and Soul* were not the same thing long ago, viz. p. 55.

Vit. I know you assert this in several places, though you are not guilty of *Reiteration*; but what do all your Assertions come to, unless you prove that God Almighty could not without an Additional Spirit make Living Man *Think* and *Ratiocinate*, &c. for *Estibius* has no Notions from *Epicurus*, *Gassendus*, or Mr. *Hobbs*, as you presume, not having ever read six Leafes in Mr. *Hobbs* in his Life, and that is now above 20 years ago, since he read them. See how you mistake.

Subst. Not so oft as you, especially in attributing Sensation, Volition and Ratiocination to Brutes.

Vit.

Vit. No, come I'll tell you several mistakes together; *First*, You say, the Gentleman says the Soul is nothing but Breathe, pag. 63. whereas he calls it a Power, and not the Breath, or *Afflatus*, we Breathe, which you seem to fancy he means. *Secondly*, That he has mistaken the Definition for the Sensitive Soul, pag. 64. You should have added the reason parallel to it, because he defines it, *Sentit & Ratiocinatur*. *Thirdly*, Because Men are Engines of a Finer Make and Contexture, *Vid.* pag. 124. *Second Thoughts*; therefore say you, for the Author, not the Author himself, *We must allow Matter capable of Sensation and Ratiocination*. Some would call this a *Fib*, Mr. *Presbyter* of the Church of England, p. 68. *Fourthly*, The Affairs of Brutes are always managed after one and the same Manner, without any Variety, pag. 70. When as it is apparent there is as much Variety in the actions of Brutes proportionably, as Men; only Men have more Ends to pursue, than Brutes, and therefore according to their greater perfection, require more variety of Actions. *Fifthly*, You say that *Estibius* supports his Doctrine by a Text out of *Esdras*, pag. 73. proving no dead Man, ever shall revive until the Resurrection; whereas he cites, *Job. 7. v. 9.* as well as *Esdras*. Now Mr. *Presbyter*, give me leave to tell you, this is not fair dealing.

Subst.

Subst. What a Bead-roll of mistakes have you heap'd up. I'll warrant you I could find 500 in the Book, if I would pick out every little Error.

Vit. That may be *perhaps*; but that is not the Business, but you not only Err often, but also make *Estibius* speak what he doth not, I tell you again this is foul play.

Subst. You have told me so, so often, that you cannot forbear Repetition, but I must tell you again, seeing you will provoke me, That *Matter and Motion* can never produce *Sensation or Ratiocination*, viz. Meer Body is incapable of producing Sense and Cogitation, pag. 68.

Vit. To this purpose you spoke before, pag. 59. So blame me not for Repetitions or Reiterations. For *Qui alterum accusat probri ipsum se intueri oportet*, you know to be an old Rule, He that accuses another of a Fault, ought to look into himself, therefore laying aside such little Cavils, let's go on. Why do you speak so slightly of the Power of *Matter and Motion*, whereas we cannot find one thing in the World can be done without it. From those Principles proceed our Thunders, and our Rain, our Lightnings, and our Hail, and all the *visible* Celestial Beings we can imagine; all the whole Frame, and Systrasis of the Elementary World, as but a result of *Matter and Motion*, as well as when God divided

(III)

vided the Waters from the Waters, as when he separated the Dry-land from them and call'd it *Earth*, Gen. 1. Nay the very whole process of the Creation from the first time that the *Spirit of God* moved upon the face of the Deep, seems to be nothing else but *Matter and Motion* gradually, carried on, till it comes to the very production of Man himself.

Subst. All this I allow, But there you must stop, for then God Breathed into Man a *Spiritual Immaterial Substance*, call'd Gen. 2. 7. *The Breath of Life*, and although *Matter and Motion*, may be said to be ingredients also of his Composition, as appears in every Living Creature, yet that *Motion* proceeded not from meer *Matter*, but from the Impulses, and Impressions of a *Spirit* implanted in him at the Creation.

Vit. Well! *Breath of Life*, must be an *Immaterial Substance*, in spite of all the absurdities and incoherences that attend it, nay, and contradictions even to the Holy Scriptures. You will have your Assertion granted, although you bring not the least proof of it. But, pray, therefore let us consider Man, as to his Composition, and Original from *Matter and Motion*, and how he is distinguishable from Brutes. For I perceive by your Arguments, pag. 59. and 82. That you apprehend the *Motion of Matter* to be no more

more than so many Atoms jumbled together, and as such (capable of being tossed to and fro only, like a mass of Stones, or Grains of Corn in a circulating Engine) cannot produce such regular things, as Thought, Discourse, Free-will, Ratiocination, whereupon of necessity we must recur to the Notion of an *Immaterial Substance* in Man to do those things.

Subst. So we must, for Matter can act no otherwise.

Vit. I am of your Opinion, if guided by your Hand or Mine, it cannot ever act otherwise; but if the *Power of God* interposes, What can you say then? Cannot he make Thought, Discourse, Free-will, Ratiocination, and all the Faculties and Powers of Man proceed from Matter? Who dares deny this not to be possible with God? And that it is actually so in Man, may be deduced from several Actions, or Operations that flow from him. As, *First*, What is his Growth, or Augmentation but a continued addition of Matter to Matter by Motion? *Secondly*, Wherein doth his *visible Life* consist but in the continual Circulation of Matter? As for that invisible Spring of invisible Life, as I may call it, flowing from its immaterial Substance, I will speak of elsewhere. *Thirdly*, What is all Sensation, but the *Material Impressions* of the Objects on the Organs of Sense? How oft do we find

find *terrible* Objects to create us repeated *Thoughts* of the same, and in our very Dreams we *think* of avoiding those dangers we dreaded as if really true? Thus if we have seen Ships toss'd in a Storm at Sea, been in danger of our Lives from a ravenous Beast, or narrowly escap'd falling down a great precipice, nay if we have been told but some dreadful Story over Night, (though in reason we believe it false) we oft find our selves in Dreams (nay awake sometimes) much affected with the *remembrance* of it, as if we really suffered what we were only told of, or saw with our exterior Organs. How doth Beauty excite the *Thoughts* of Lust, and an injury done, the *Thoughts* of Revenge? So that you plainly see, that *Thoughts* may be created in Man by material Impressions, causing various Passions or Motions in the minds of Men, as living Creatures.

Subst. This I can grant, but these are impressions made on the *Sensitive Soul*, not the Rational.

Vit. Very good. But how do you distinguish these *Thoughts* that arise from the *Sensitive Soul*, from those which arise from the *Rational*? I know no other *Criterion* you have to distinguish them than from the *End*, as sensitive *Thoughts* tend to Evil, and rational to good Ends. But again I make this Rejoynder, that Impressi-

ons from an Image creates Thoughts of Devotion, which is a good End, yet it's plain these Impressions proceed from material Objects, and move the Animal Spirits, or rather whole Man into a tendency of Devotion. How do we see the power of Fancy (whence our *Thoughts* arise) make a similitude of Soul and Body, as I may say, in Children from their Parents sometimes? How evident is it beyond contradiction that some sort of Meats produce evil *Thoughts*? What can possibly be more demonstrative, against even those that deny all Authority of the Holy Scriptures, to tell them, according to their own very principles, that Matter and Motion has produc'd *Life, Sensation and Ratiocination*, which can be done by no power, but the power of God! But if a Spirit be named to actuate the Body, that is so easie to be comprehended, as possible, that they may ridicule your Notion, because they cannot any ways *discern that Spirit*; whereas they easily can Matter and Motion, because they are so evident to the Senses. Therefore then so far the point is gain'd, &c. go on.

Vit. Very good! Then so far the point is gain'd, that the sensitive Soul is capable of *Thinking* (if these notions flow from the sensitive Soul) and that Matter and Motion may cause *thoughts* there, and if so, we have nothing more to prove, than

that from them may also proceed a *Regularity of Thought*, Discourse, Free-will, Deliberation and all parts of Ratiocination.

Subst. If you can prove that, *eris mihi magnus Apollo.*

Vit. I told you before, that by the Power of God Man cannot be denied to act rationally, as consisting of Life and Matter, without the assistance of a Spiritual Substance; now if *Thought* may be performed without that aid, as it's apparent it may, in Men and Brutes, the Principal Action of the Soul (as you call it, and I of the living Man) viz. *Cogitation* may be perform'd by Matter and Motion, which *Cogitation* must very oft be regular, because it follows the genuine impressions of the Object, and answers to the thing represented. Terrible Objects create Frightful Thoughts, and Lustful Objects Lustful Thoughts, &c. so that there is plainly in some measure a *Regularity*, though not to that height of perfection, I own, as to answer that likeness in which God made Man. Neither dare I say, that if a Brute think, he must have *Free-will*, because that is a perfection only of Man, but still this only argues perfection, so that this I dare avow, That as all those acts of Reason, viz. *Deliberation*, *Free-will*, &c. have their Basis on *Thought*, and as they flow from previous Thoughts, weigh'd in respect of the

conveniency or inconveniency of Actions to be done, it is a natural inference enough that *Matter and Motion* may very oft be the Guides of our Free-will, and the Balance of our Deliberation. Thus you see *Matter and Motion* when seriously considered, are no such contemptible principles. I have the longer insisted on this head, because the whole hinge of your Argument seem to turn on this point, that *Matter and Motion* are not capable of producing those noble Operations we find in Man. And if I am not able to explain how they answer all *Actions* of Man's Reasoning Faculty, yet the *principal* of them, viz. *Thoughts* I have, I presume, sufficiently Answered, our Saviour speaking of Evil Thoughts, saies *They are those that defile* [not the Soul but] *the Man*, Mat. 15. 20. So the *Thoughts* seem to relate to the *Compositum*, and not to the *Soul*, or *half part* of Man.

Subst. I know you ascribe Thoughts or Power of Thinking to the Material Man *Compositum*, but it is an unfair way of Arguing. For the Soul of Man is distinguished from Man by its Spirituality, its Metaphysical Notions wholly abstracted from Matter, pag. 78.

Vit. You say without giving any Reason as it is usual with you, 'tis an *unfair way of Arguing*. I am sure as to that Demonstration we can have to our Senses, we find these

these Actions manifestly flow from the *Living Creature*, and in your way we are forced to *suppose* an Immaterial Substance to be the spring of all bodily Actions, as you call it, *pag. 54.* now which Opinion a Rational Man would most readily embrace, judge you.

Subst. But you have so many absurdities attend your Opinion, as *First*, It robs God of his Prerogative in being the Father of Spirits, *pag. 74.* *Secondly*, To confute your self, you say it is *infus'd* into Man by God Almighty, *pag. 75.* *Thirdly*, You blind Material with Immaterial Substances. *Fourthly*, You make Man a piece of Rational Mechanism, *pag. 73. and 82.*

Vit. A mighty Charge indeed: *First*, If I deny Man to have a Spirit, is not God the Father of Angels, who are so oft call'd Spirits? *Secondly*, If I say, *the Soul is infus'd*, [meaning a Substance] (else you say nothing to the purpose) you should have quored the place, but I don't doubt but that's as fallie, as your other Quotation, when you say, *He acknowledgeth the Rational Soul to be a pure Spirit*, *pag. 75.* I am afraid, Dear Sir, as your Soul, so your Arguments are not *Material* (to jest a little in your own Dialect) and I must tell you that the Truth of your Assertions is as *invisible* too, as your dear *Immaterial Substance*. There is a certain local Proverb, I have heard, *my Son don't lie, but if you do;*
I 3 besure

besure stand in't. Now I'll but change the Sentence, and say, Dear Doctor, *Don't Err, but if you do, besure persist in it* and then you'll make *Esiubius's* words good to be led on by one continued Series of Error, pag. 2. *Ep. Ded.*

Subst. Nay, seeing you use me no worse than the Fathers and Councils of the Church, I am content to be in so good Company.

Vit. I know, you say, I look on them as Ideots, and B——'s or the like, but I tell you plain, that if they teach us such Doctrines as are not warranted by the Holy Scriptures, I shall presume to dissent from either Fathers or Councils, which you your self never lean on, pag. 16. if they are brought as *Expositors* or *Commentators* of the Holy Scriptures; now what is this but to make your self the only Judge Commentator and Expositor of the Holy Scriptures? You can tell us also how perhaps to blend Material with Immaterial Substances, for in troth I know not how, tho you say I do, pag. 73. And as for *Man being Clockwork* (as you told us once before it is such a curious piece of Artifice, and shows none but an Omnipotent Power could be the Artificer, therefore I think you have lessened the Fathers, or magnified your self very much.

Subst. You have a *Magisterial way* with you, that I observe, and seem never satisfied unless it be explain'd to you, how the *Modus* of things are. I confess, though we cannot conceive the *manner* of the Souls Action and Passion, when it voluntarily moves it, yet we are as certain it doth so, as of any Mathematical Truth whatever, pag. 86.

Vit. This is a bold stroke on my word, if you would have me never inquire into the *Modus* of a thing, you must prove it the meer object of Faith, and I have done. And as for the certainty of the Souls acting so, as you say, I think I may as flatly deny, as you assert, because the certainty of Action proceeds from the certain Existence of the Living Creature, and not from the dubious Existence of the Soul. If the Existence of the Soul, as a *Spiritual Substance*, were as plainly evident, as that of Living Man, no one could deny your position.

Subst. Are you certain the Soul has parts into which it is divisible, as you pretend to prove, *Will* and *Understanding* to be essential parts of the Soul, pag. 94.

Vit. Nay, there you have me indeed! Had you read lately *Smiglecius's Logick*, or *Suarez's Metaphysicks*, and several *Ethicks*, you would have found the Words *partes Essentiales Anima, Voluntas, & Intellectus*, perhaps very oft; but if you will allow

besure stand in't. Now I'll but change the Sentence, and say, Dear Doctor, *Don't Err, but if you do, besure persist in it,* and then you'll make *Esiibius's* words good to be led on by one continued Series of Error, pag. 2. Ep. Ded.

Subst. Nay, seeing you use me no worse than the Fathers and Councils of the Church, I am content to be in so good Company.

Vit. I know, you say, I look on them as Ideots, and B——'s or the like, but I tell you plain, that if they teach us such Doctrines as are not warranted by the Holy Scriptures, I shall presume to dissent from either Fathers or Councils, which you your self never lean on, pag. 16. if they are brought as *Expositors* or *Commentators* of the Holy Scriptures; now what is this but to make your self the only Judge Commentator and Expositor of the Holy Scriptures? You can tell us also how perhaps to blend Material with Immaterial Substances, for in troth I know not how, tho you say I do, pag. 73. And as for *Man being Clockwork* (as you told us once before it is such a curious piece of Artifice, &c. shows none but an Omnipotent Power could be the Artificer, therefore I think you have lessened the Fathers, or magnified your self very much.

Subst. You have a *Magisterial* way with you, that I observe, and seem never satisfied unless it be explain'd to you, how the *Modus* of things are. I confess, though we cannot conceive the *manner* of the Souls Action and Passion, when it voluntarily moves it, yet we are as certain it doth so, as of any Mathematical Truth whatever, pag. 86.

Vit. This is a bold stroke on my word, if you would have me never inquire into the *Modus* of a thing, you must prove it the meer object of Faith, and I have done. And as for the certainty of the Souls acting so, as you say, I think I may as flatly deny, as you assert, because the certainty of Action proceeds from the certain Existence of the Living Creature, and not from the dubious Existence of the Soul. If the Existence of the Soul, as a *Spiritual Substance*, were as plainly evident, as that of Living Man, no one could deny your position.

Subst. Are you certain the Soul has *parts* into which it is divisible, as you pretend to prove, *Will* and *Understanding* to be essential parts of the Soul, pag. 94.

Vit. Nay, there you have me indeed! Had you read lately *Smiglecius's* Logick, or *Suarez's* Metaphysicks, and several *Ethicks*, you would have found the Words *partes Essentiales Anima, Voluntas, & Intellectus*, perhaps very oft; but if you will allow them

them to be *Powers or Faculties*, so they are but *Essentials* of the *Soul*, it is the same thing, as to the force of the Argument. I'll not quibble about Words.

Subst. Yes, you do, for you recur to the Etymological Significations of the word *Soul* in Hebrew, Greek and Latine, as the main stress to build your Opinion on, pag. 100.

Vit. Assure your self, I do not relye on them, as the *Basis* to support my Opinion; but I do own I have recited them to let the World see, That the Acceptations of the Words *Soul and Spirit*, are so very various, that *no Body ought to depend on them purely, as Argumentative*, especially in the Hebrew Tongue, where the same word often signifies two contrary things. But of the Genuine Sense of the Context, the usual acception of the Words in other cases, the agreeableness of the Text with Reason, and other similar places in Scripture do all concur, then the Etymological Signification seems to add weight to the Argument, provided *false Latin as Anima*, in pag. 101. be not hall'd in head and shoulders, as we say, to expound an unintelligible Sentence.

Subst. I think my Sentences are plain enough; for the Body is the Instrument of the Operations of the *Soul*, pag. 96. and let a Man try if he can form a better Idea of a *Material* than of an *Immaterial Soul*, pag. 98. if he can, let me tell him the Nature

Nature of the Soul is as *clearly understood*, as that of the Body, or Material Man, *p. 98.* For Breath of Life (which we call *Soul*) can be no otherwise understood, than to signify a Spiritual Substance distinct from the Body. Now are not all these plain Sentences?

Vit. Yes very plain indeed, but not one of them proved no more than that *Henceforth* signifies *immediately*, *pag. 105.* the best I can say of them is, That they are good round positive Assertions. For you say, That *Esibius* owns *Plato* as the Inventor of this Opinion, and is silent as to *Pherecydes* the Philosopher, or *Thales* whom *Cicero* and others declare to be the first Authors of this Opinion, *pag. 123.* You have really a good stock of Imp ——— Divinity to publish such an Assertion in Print, whereas it is perfectly contradicted, *p. 356. l. 18. &c. Second Thoughts.* One would have thought you should have left this way off, toward the end of your Book, knowing your self so oft detected before.

Subst. How did I know you would pry so narrowly into my Answer, I might suppose, you might read my Book as cursorily, as I read yours, and then I would have jerk'd you off. Where Arguments are deficient, I do what I can to excite Power against you, and bid the Governours of the Church rouse up *their noble Courage they have*

have always shown against you and your *Profelytes*, if you have any, *p. ult.*

Vit. I am sensible you do so, but you bid the *Papists* look to themselves, they are of age, *p. ult.* So that by a side-wind, you call in their aid, and assistance too; all the rebuke I shall give you is, *That ye know not of what Spirit you are of.* Learn what that means.

Subst. Methinks you are mighty grave in your Rebukes, but before you end this Controversie, pray tell me your main Bulwark Argument against us: How doth this Opinion of the Souls going *immediately* to Heaven or Hell, make void and useless the day of a General Judgment? For the Irreversible and Divine appointment to Good and Evil Souls hence departed, to different States and Places is that which Divines call a *Particular Judgment*; but whether there be a *Particular Examination* of our *Thoughts, Words* and *Actions* immediately after Death, or whether there be no such thing, till the Universal Day of Judgment, the thing is the same as—*p. 120.*

Vit. As to what? Is it the same as to *Rewards and Punishments*? Are they rewarded by a *Particular Judgment*, or punish'd by a *Particular Judgment immediately after Death*?

Subst. No, it is the same as to the deterring us from present *Wickedness*, if there be an unalterable Assignment of different Habitations to Good and Bad Persons (you mean Souls) in the other *Life*, as soon as they pass into it, *pag. 121.*

Vit.

Vit. You are very right, Sir, it will deter us from present Vices, but that is not under debate, you flip'd *Rewards and Punishments*. And by your good leave, How come we to differ? If I say, *Man lies in the Grave in a State of Insensibility until the Resurrection*, which is undoubtedly his assign'd Habitation (if I may so call it) in Scripture; and you assert *Man by an irreversible Decree assign'd in his Soul, to some other place*, as you do without letting us know what *Joy or Misery* He is consign'd to, nay seem to doubt whether He be consign'd to any, seeing you cannot make it out He has a *particular Examination*? without which unquestionably no Man shall be Punish'd, pag. 120. l. 23. Our difference may be easily enough Reconciled. For you write more for *Estibius* in some places, than against him.

Subst. How so, I have told you all along that it is an *Heretical Opinion to say the Soul is not Immortal*; I have likewise told you, how *Estibius* has his Notion from *Hobbs*, &c. and that the *Soul* is but the Spring of Bodily Life, and that the *Body*, is but the Instrument of the *Soul*, &c.

Vit. I know you say all these fine things, but pag. 130. you seem to spoil all you have said before, and joyn with him in his very Notion, from that very Text too, from whence you had drawn the foundation
tion

tion of your *Substantiality of Human Soul*, Gen. 2. v. 7. Now whereas *Estibius* tells you, pag. 210. *Second Thoughts, That Life is the Soul and Immortal*, because it cannot die, so you say the Soul is *imperishable*, because *Life cannot die*, *ibid*. Truly I doubt your Soul *slept a little*, when you wrote that Sentence, so contradictory to your former Positions.

Subst. That Opinion of me comes from your *Misapprehension*, and not being able to distinguish between *Bodily Life*, and the *Life* that accompanies the Soul.

Vit. There indeed I acknowledge my Error, as you ought to do that of your Distinction, least the Wags should say, *If you are not stop'd, you will by and by prove a Man has nine lives, as the vulgar say of a Cat*. How or where did you find the Distinction of *Bodily Life* mention'd, pag. 54. from that *Life* which cannot die mention'd, pag. 130.

Come, Gentlemen, in so serious a concern as this, let us not trifle, but debate the Matter as high, and as nice as the subject will bear, in order to find out the Truth of this Controversie, which I wish some one or other would Heartily, and Industriously oppugn, if Erroneous, and Heretical (as the Ignorant call it) with such solid Reasons and Arguments drawn from Scripture, that would put the debate out of all doubt, let it run in its ancient Channel

nel without obstruction amongst the Wise and Learned, as well as others, but I think with modesty I may safely say of you two Gentlemen, what was said to old *Anchises*,——

*Non tali Auxilio, nec defensoribus istis
Lis eget Hac,—— Vir.*

To which I may add another as material to my self, *Errare possum, Hereticus esse volo*. I, Man, may Err, but I would not willingly be an Heretick, *i. e.* persist and be obstinate, after a plain Conviction, in that Erroneous Opinion. For notwithstanding ye have made light and trivial Reflections very oft on *Estibius*, much unbecoming the Dignity of your Function, and such which never add any merit to the Cause, you see He has patiently pass'd them by, and in candor pardons your Zeal, though He blames your Discretion. And because you make a noise very oft about the *Immortality of the Soul*, What a damnable *Heresie* is it, says one, to deny the *Immortality of the Soul*? What an *Heretical Conclusion* is it says another, to say the *Soul is Mortal*? Now what is all this but Noise and Tumult to excite the Vulgar, may others also in an higher Station, into an *Odium* against the Author, and if there be a Knot which He has brought into the World which we cannot untie, to pro-

provoke them to cut it, I mean, to try
 the Opinion down right or wrong, under the
 pretence of the Authors, to take away and
 destroy the *Immortality of the Soul*. And
 this *clamour* arises, as I find, more parti-
 cularly, from that part of the Clergy, who
 are most Ignorant, either in Church-Hi-
 story, the Fathers, Councils, or Expositors
 on the Scriptures, and I forbear to trace
 their Ignorance any farther. But this was
 no more than *Estibius* expected, as he tells
 you, in his last Chapter, but from Men
 of so Honourable a Function, he might
 have justly expected to have been treated
 in another *Manner* than he has been, with-
 out little trifling *Reflections* on his Profes-
 sion, (a Profession I think very Honourable
 in it self, and I am sure not inferior to
 the Best, according to their Numbers in
 Men of good Sense and Learning) and
 without Ecclesiastical Threats, and, I may
 say, Bulls, that encompass him on every
 side. For if his Opinion be false, let him
 first be confuted, and then if He persist,
 call it *Heretical*, which I doubt will be
 very hard to do, notwithstanding that
mighty sounding Railery against him for en-
 deavouring to destroy the *Immortality of*
the Soul. For who can call that *Hereti-
 cal* to disbelieve the propriety of a Being,
 whose Existence cannot be proved? If
 Light, for Example, were (as it is), the
 necessary property of the Sun, could any
 Man

Man be angry with me, that I disbelieved there was such a thing as Light, if He could not prove there was such a Being as the Sun? Now if the Being of your *Immaterial Substance*, call'd *Human Soul*, appear'd but plain to Reason, though not so plain as the *Sun* to the Eyes, by the Authority of the Scriptures, I would say then Mr. *Turner's* four *Likes* mention'd, pag. 58. were all true, and *Estibius* ought to recant. But seeing the most common received Axioms in Philosophy, Reason and Divinity seem to be stretched to save that Notion of an *Immaterial Substance* in Man, and out of all the common course of Nature you must except (say they) the *Rational Soul*, to make good the verity of an Axiom, What can the Nobility and Gentry, and others of the Laymen think (if none of the Clergy will not) but that they have, imbib'd a Latent, and absconded Error, for many Generations, contrary to the knowledge even of their Guides who ought to have instructed them better, had they known it? This is the most modest Interpretation can be made of it at present, for supposing it be an Error, it is wholly pardonable, because Inevitable; and as to those, who think such an Opinion not Erroneous, I hope they will endeavour beyond controverſie to convince me, as I shall hereafter to do them; but as for me, who am become a Convert
to

to this Doctrine or Principle, now I know and believe it to be a *notorious Error in Christianity*, to say, *the Soul is an Immaterial Substance*, with all the properties usually attributed to it, &c. I think I should *sin against knowledge*, if I disbeliev'd it, and I wish I could not say, might *hazard my Salvation to hold such a Tenent so inconsistent with the Doctrine of Christianity and the Holy Scriptures*, which whatsoever opposes, doth undoubtedly dissent from the *Orthodox Faith*, and may (after knowledge) be styled *Heretical*; and as to those Arguments Mr. *Presbyter of the Church of England*, as he calls himself, has drawn from the Authority of the Church of England out of our Liturgy, I presum'd He had read *Second Thoughts* so far, as to be very well satisfied from *Estivius* of the Reasons of those good Pious Christians Actions; but to show him, that they also were of Opinion that *Life was taken for Soul*, Read the Prayer for the Deliverance from the Plague (before recited,) *In the midst of Judgment remembering Mercy, hast redeem'd our Souls from the Jaws of Death.*——

Again, in one of the Prayers in the Communion-service, *As the Son of God did vouchsafe to yield up his Soul by Death upon the Cross for your Salvation*; Parallel to that of *David*, who hast delivered our Souls from Death, and our Feet from Falling, wherefore such an Opinion, as to one part there-

of at least, is not, nor ever was a Novelty, or call'd *Heretical* by the Church of England, whom He endeavours so earnestly to excite against *Estibius*. But because He was under so great a mistake of the *Soul's-sleeping*, being *Estibius's* Doctrine, I will even in Writing also, let him *Rest* undisturb'd, and without the affliction of reading his Book any more, quietly let him *Stumber* Life away, without any farther trouble from me.

Subst. Here I find you have made a long Harangue, but pray, Sir, don't forget your Axioms, you talk of in Philosophy, Reason and Divinity that made you a Convert. For you pretend totally to Demonstration, and they are usually the Bottom or Foundation of such Argumentation.

Viz. That I will do immediately, and I think they are such that ought to have the greatest prevalence imaginable to by-pass any Man, so that nothing but the express Words of the Holy Scripture, saying, *Human Soul is an Immaterial Substance, Immortal, and passes immediately to Heaven or Hell after Death*, should convince me to the contrary, if these Maxims or Axioms are true. For where I find manifest contradictions to common receiv'd Maxims in Philosophy, Reason and Divinity, that Doctrine must not only be well grounded, but very plain and evident that must make me believe such Maxims false, if any such

K Doctrine

Doctrines can be said at all to be well grounded.

Subst. I am of your Opinion in that point, but I think the common received Doctrine of the Church, and approved of for several Hundred Years, is of better authority than all the Maxims you can bring. For why should not they be as discerning as you, if it had been a Doctrine so contradictory to *Philosophy, Reason and Religion*? as you pretend.

Vit. Truly, Sir, I think that no Argument in this Case, for we know the Doctrine of the Mass, Purgatory, &c. has prevailed several Hundred Years [almost 1100] and by the Authority of a Church also: The Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* came in later, yet has continued in a Church several Hundred Years, and altho' the Reformed Churches, many of them at least, look'd upon that Doctrine as contrary to Sense and Reason (though the Papists have plainer, and more evident Texts for it, than you have for your *Immaterial Substance*, call'd *Soul*) yet they embraced another as absurd in the Opinion of our Church, as the former, viz. *Consubstantiation*, i. e. The real Existence of the Body of Christ, and Elements in the Sacrament together. So that these Reformers rejected the Authority of the Church, when their Principles were not consonant to Sense and Reason, though they seem'd

to be establish'd by some Texts in Scripture. And perhaps that may be our Case.

Subst. When it is so proved, and the Authority of the Church confirms it, then I shall like it. But to your Maxims, Sir.

Vit. No, but first let us state the grounds on which we dissent, least some *Dreamer* or other, may reply again about the *Soul's sleeping*; whereupon, I say, That *First*, Human Soul, is nothing but a *Power or faculty implanted by God Almighty in Man*, as He consists of Matter and the outward form He bears.

Subst. But I say, Human Soul is an *Immaterial Substance*, united to the Body of Man.

Vit. Man goes not to Heaven or Hell when he dies according to God's *common Methods of Providence*, but lies in the Grave in a state of Insensibility until the day of a General Resurrection.

Subst. When Man dies, he goes to Heaven or Hell *immediately* in his Soul, which is then separated from the Body, and doth receive either Bliss or Punishment, though not to that degree Man will have after the Re-union of Body and Soul at the Resurrection.

Vit. That *Life* is properly the Soul of Man meant in the Holy Scriptures, in relation to his Composition.

Subst. That *Life* in the Holy Scriptures signifies also an *Immaterial Living Substance*, united to the Body, as well as that *Life* which *now* is.

Vit. That God has rais'd several *Persons* from the Dead, as his *immediate Favourites*, as was *Abraham*, &c. and translated them to Heaven before a General Resurrection.

Subst. That it was the Soul of *Abraham*, &c. that was in Heaven, and not his Body and Soul, or Person.—

Vit. That no wicked Person will be raised, or punished before a General Judgment.

Subst. That the Wicked are Damn'd in their Souls to Hell as soon as they die, though not to the utmost Torments thereof.

Vit. If a Man be not *Righteous* enough to deserve to be a *Favourite* of God in this World, he shall lye in the Grave in a State of Insensibility until the Resurrection.

Subst. All righteous Men shall have *Immediate Happiness* as soon as they die, tho' not compleat in their Souls.—

Vit. That *Life* being the *Soul* of *Man*, according to the Tenour of the Scriptures, it wholly perishes with the Body, and cannot be Immortal.

Subst. That an *Immaterial Substance* being the *Soul* of *Man*, it cannot die but is Immortal.

Vit. Now according to these Heads or Positions, I do aver, That the Notion of an *Immaterial Substance* cannot be reconciled to these following *Axioms* in Philosophy.

Axiom. 1. Materiale non potest Agere in Immateriale, neque Immateriale in Materiale.

A Material Being cannot act upon an Immaterial, nor an Immaterial upon a Material.

The Reason of this *Axiom* I take to be grounded on the following.

Axiom. 2. Omnis Actio fit per Contactum.

All Action is made by Contact.—

Now there being no possible Conception in Nature, or Idea how a Contact can be made between a Material, and Immaterial Being (as Mr. *Presbyter* of the Church of England, as he calls himself, owns, pag. 86.) The Philoso-

pher may well conclude that no Action and Passion could be between them. Wherefore this Axiom cannot be true, unless you except Human Soul, for it is demonstratively plain, that the Soul if such an Immaterial Being, acts on the Body, and the Body very oft on the Soul. Here I expect the reply of a *Virtual Contact*, by which means God Almighty himself acts on all Beings whatever, and so doth the Soul in our Body, and Angels, and Spirits. To which I answer, *First*.

We ought here to talk Philosophy, and not Divinity to explain our Philosophy, therefore I am sure this is not fairly urg'd in this place: But *Secondly*, As God's name is, *I am that I am*, so as mysterious and unconceivable is the *Modus* of his Omnipotence, acting on second Causes, which I define to be *Fiat & Fit*. Therefore I presume no parallel ought to be made between God's Acting, and the Acting of our Souls, unless the Existence of those *Substantial Spirits*, were as evident to our Reason, as that of God, Angels, &c. *Thirdly*, A *Virtual Contact* can signifie no more than *Mediate*, or *Mediante altero corpore*, as the Philosophers say, so that if a Body be interpos'd, by which the Soul must Act upon our Bodies to move it, &c. The same difficulty returns, as it is Body, or Material still upon which an Immaterial Being must act—Upon which follows this Consequential Axiom.

Axiom

Axiom. 3. Materiale non potest esse Impedimento Operationum Entis Immaterialis.——

A Material Being cannot hinder the Operations of an Immaterial.

This is grounded partly on the former, and partly on the Nature of Spirits assigned by Philosophers, and the difference between them and Quantitative Bodies. *Quorum* (say they)

Axiom. 4. Dimensionum Penetratio est Impossibilis, sed Non-quantitativorum, possibilis.

The Penetration of the Dimension of Bodies is impossible, by Reason two Bodies being Quantitative, i. e. having a *Longitude*, *Latitude* and *Depth*, call'd *Dimensions*, cannot possibly be together in one place at the same time. But such Bodies as are *Spiritual Substances*, may be in the same place at the same time, and penetrate Material Bodies as they please, yet not make the Body so Penetrated, Longer, Broader, or indeed any way whatever Bigger, because they are not *Quantitative*. Now, if this *Axiom* be true, what can hinder us but that all our Knowledge should be In-

titive or Angelical? How is it possible a Man should ever be Mad or Distracted. Seeing it is impossible a Spirit, or Spiritual Substance should be affected with Madness, if it were without Body. And if the Body can affect it, that Notion contradicts *Axiom* 1. 2. So that it's plainly repugnant to the common receiv'd Maxims in Philosophy.

Axiom. 5. Omnis Forma est sui Multiplicativa, or as others say,

Axiom. 6. Simile producit sibi simile

Every Form multiplies it self, and like begets its like. —

Now least the Philosopher here should interfere with Divinity, the Theologists beg leave to excuse *Anima Humana* from multiplying it self, or begetting its likeness. For you must know that by this Maxim is meant a *Specificall Likeness*, and not *Identical*, so that one Beast generates another as to Matter and Form, in likeness to himself, viz. an Horse an Horse, a Dog a Dog, &c. But if you enquire into the Generation of Man, you are told, and must acquiesce in it too, or be an Heretick, That one Man Generates half, viz. the Body, and God Almighty infuses, at some time or other, we know not how, nor when, nor where

where, the other half of Man, so that betwixt both whole Man is begotten. I tremble almost to think of those Impious and absurd Consequences deducible from this Doctrine, if I durst give my self a latitude to expose it.

Axiom. 7. Omnis Forma Educitur è potentia Materiae.

Every Form is produced, or brought forth out of the Power of Matter; here you must excuse the *Forma Humana*, viz. *Anima Rationalis* again, or else our *Axiom* is totally subverted, though in all other Cases every way true, as are the former; and so own'd even by the most Principal Divines in the World. But why these Maxims in Philosophy, as they are Maxims of Reason also, and confirm'd by common Observation, should have such unwarrantable Limitations, there cannot possibly be the least Colour, or pretence of Reason given, unless they were contrary to the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, which no Man alive can make so to be, unless I will grant the Existence of the Substantial Spirit, or Immaterial Substance of Man. Nay even then also, are they reconcilable to the Holy Scriptures, as to Man's Generation, as I could easily prove, if leisure would permit.

Axiom.

Axiom. 8. *Duæ completæ Substantiæ sibi invicem unitæ, non faciunt unum per se.*

This is a Metaphysical Axiom, *That two complete Substances, conjoyn'd together, cannot make a third complete Being* (as I may render it the easier to be understood) or *Ens unum per se*. The usual way of Explanation is from an heap of Stones, or the like, whereof every individual Stone is a compleat Being of it self, but conjoyn'd with other Stones, they together make what we call an Heap, or an *Ens per accidens*. Now if Man, that is God Almighty's perfectest piece of Workmanship in this sublunary World, be made up of two compleat substances, *viz.* Body, and a Self-subsisting Soul, what can we say of him but that he is inferior in composition than the very Beasts, and a meer jumbled Mass, which I am sure is a great Derogation to the honour of his Creator. These are the Philosophical Maxims your Immaterial Substance subverts or wholly contradicts.—— Other Maxims are those which are deducible from the Principles of Reason, which the Notion of an Immaterial Substance with all its Attributes either subverts, or is wholly repugnant to us.

Axiom. 9. *Rationi minimè consentaneum est duas Naturas, specificè distinctas, sine aliquo intermedio, posse uniri.*

It is in no wise consistent with Reason, That two Natures specifically different should be united, without some third thing to conjoyn them.

This is so true a Maxim, That a Man must deny common Experience, and his own Senses that denies it. For if a third thing interposes, Fire and Water may be United, and contrary Elements conjoyned, though specifically different from each other. But when we come to talk of the Union of Body and Soul, Material and Immaterial (which every Man allows unquestionably to be specifically different) the difficulty is swallow'd down so easily, that we never examine into it, nor enquire what third thing cements the two specifically different Natures, though at the same time we look upon a *Chimera*, or *Hirco-cervus* (the feign'd composition only of Brute with Brute, and not at so great distance as to differ specifically) to be only the Child of Fancy, and Off-spring of the Imagination. Again, if we consult Naturalists, we find many productions Heterogeneous, from the Copulation of
[Beastly]

[Beastly] Men with Brutes, and that those Productions have not only had the outward shape of a Man, but also the faculty of a glimmering Reason, shining above the rest of common Brutes. How then can we answer for the Union of those Souls so specifically different, as will be agreed on by the most prejudiced *Substanimist* whatever? If the Rational and Beastly Soul have in that Compositum an Union, 'tis such a prodigious conjunction, as supercedes all Reason to comprehend it, and all Criticks to make it out how it's consistent with Religion, because

Axiom. 10. *Pœna sequitur culpam, & Omnes Animæ Humanæ deliquentes pœnam merentur.*—————

Punishment necessarily follows a Fault; and consequently, All Human Souls offending, deserve Punishment.

Now that there is an Human Soul (for as it is said to be a Spirit, it has not parts) totally in such a Production, if generated by Man, is a Concession, I doubt, must be granted, and consequently it may offend and be liable to Punishment of Eternal Damnation; but if we grant this, what a gross irreligious absurdity, and reflection on Christianity do we yield to. Yet these are the Labyrinths, and Perplexities

plexities that this Notion of Human Soul, being an Immaterial Spirit, brings us into. But if Man in this Case of an Heterogeneous Production generated no Human Soul, he can be said to generate nothing at all Human, but its manifestly evident by Observation, that several of such Productions have Human Shape, and very oft show vigorous efforts of Reason, that Criterion by which you distinguish Man from other Creatures.

Axiom. 11. Cujus Existentia nec probari potest per Causas, vel per Effectus, Illud nullam habet.

That they which cannot be proved to have a Being by its Causes, or Effects, has no Being at all.——

This is so Rational an *Axiom*, that it is Universally received without exception amongst the Philosophers; but if we come to Argue with the Divines, we find an *Human Soul*, or *Immaterial Substance* rais'd up against us to Barter, and Confound our Understanding, as well as Subvert the Truth of this Maxim. For they tell us, That all the Internal Actions of Man, *viz.* Thought, Deliberation, Reasoning, Will, &c. are the Effects of an Immaterial Substance in us, when as they give us not the least ground to prove either the *Immateriality*,

lity, or *Substantiality* of that Being existing in us, by its Causes or Effects, so as to limit such Actions as that they cannot possibly be done by *Living Man*.

Axiom. 12. *Quod nec videtur improbabile, nec impossibile comprehendere, si dem citius meretur, quam quod utrumque videtur involvere.*—

What seems neither improbable, or impossible to be comprehended, deserves our Belief sooner, than what seems to involve both.—

This is a very Rational *Axiom*, though it may admit of more Exceptions than some of the former; now seeing all these difficulties necessarily attend the Nature of *Human Soul*, as it is defin'd our *Immaterial Substance*, I will leave my Reader to judge, which Opinion he most readily can incline to, whether it seems not more probable, and possible to be *Comprehended*, that God endow'd Man with the Power of Reasoning, &c. as he is a *Living Creature*, rather than with such an *Immaterial Substance*, as the Philosophical Expression plainly shows us whence it came:

Axiom. 13. Eadem pœna & non major indistinctè Omnibus ejusdem Criminis usquequaque Reis infligi debet ut sit Justa, nisi aliqua suggeratur Causa que Delinquentem aliquomodo excuset, aut premat.

The same Punishment, and no greater, ought to be inflicted equally upon every One that is in every Circumstance guilty of the same Crime, to denominate the same a just Punishment, unless some Cause be suggested to mitigate or encrease the Punishment.——

This is an *Axiom* commonly verified by all Mankind, upon which account the Degrees of Punishment are so variable, either as to Duration, or Infliction. But in relation to this *Axiom*, I shall speak more in the following Paragraphs.

Axiom.

Axiom.

Axiom. 14. *Ubi Personalia occurrent Rationabiliter præsumendum est Personam omnimodò Intelligi.*—

Where *Personals* happen out (as You, Thou, Thee, Ye,) there it is rationally presum'd the *Person* altogether is thereby meant and intended.

This *Axiom* has likewise a solid Foundation in Reason, and I am sure is confirm'd by common Practice and Experience, although I find it in no Book, but that of Nature. For if I call a Man to me, and say *Thou*, or *You* come hither, do this or that, I plainly mean the *Person* of that Man, as he is a *Living Creature*, or made up of Body and Soul; but in the Language of some Divines, *Thou* signifies but *half the Man*, or of the *Person* of Man, *Luke 23. 43.* *Thou Thief on the Cross*, &c. and *Abraham, Isaac and Moses*, signify no more than their *half-part*, viz. their *Souls* being in Heaven; though I doubt such Divines would call any Layman Block-head, if they call'd *John, James* or *William*, and did say they meant not their *whole Persons*, but their *Legs*, to walk to them upon such an Appellation. For if a *Part* be taken for the *Whole* (as Mr. T——r says) in such Common, Obvious and Familiar Appellations, why may we not

not make use of an Integral, which is visible to our Eyes as well as an invisible constituent *Part*, hardly (if at all) cognoscible by our Understanding.

In the last place I will mention those *Axioms* of Religion and Texts of Scripture, to which that Notion of an Immaterial Self-subsisting Substance is not reconcilable, as

Axiom. 15. Omnes Animæ Humanæ Innocentium Beatitudini addicuntur.

All Human Souls of Innocents are adjudg'd to Happiness.

This is such a Principle of Christianity, that I think no Body yet denied, and as such by the Constitution of Our Church, they are allow'd Christian Burial; but if we come to enquire what becomes of the *Souls of Abortives*, as their Living indicates that they have Souls, for

Axiom. 16. *Quicquid habet Vitam, habet etiam Animam.*

Whatever has Life must have a Soul. They tell us the Souls of Abortives are as Nothing, have no place of Beatitude assign'd them, or will ever partake of Happiness in the next World, and therefore the Church takes no more notice of them in their Burial, than as if they had never been. This I am sure is the common received Opinion of the Universal Church, yet if it be manifestly that they have Life, as it is, and consequently Souls, unquestionably Innocent, we ought either to adjudge them in a State of Salvation and Happiness as well as the Souls of those Innocents of riper Years if this Maxim be true. So that either we must deny Life in Abortives to be an undeniable Index of an Human Soul existing in those born from Christians, or else treat them as capable of Eternal Happiness at our Deaths.

Axiom.

Axiom. 17. *Quaecunque Doctrina anſam ſuperſtitioni præbet, à Chriſtiano vero non debet prudenter edoceri, niſi Cauſa Maniſeſta præpolleat, que Chriſtianum alias inclinet.*————

Whatever Doctrin^e affords the ground, or handle to ſuperſtition, ought not in Prudence to be taught by a good Chriſtian, unleſs ſome other manifeſt Reaſon prevail, to incline him otherwiſe ſo to do.——

This is a Maxim relating to the prudential part of Chriſtian Practice, as directed to a weak Brother, as St. Paul ſays, *Him that is weak in the Faith receive you, but not to doubtful Diſputations*, Rom. 14. 1. But I do not urge it as a Maxim that carries with it Demonſtration, as ſome of the former do. For it is a true Maxim alſo, That *abusus non tollit uſum*, the Abufe of a thing doth not take away the uſe of it, and if it did *manifeſtly* appear, that Man had that *Immaterial Subſtance* in him, the abuſe the Papiſt makes of ſuch a Doctrin^e relating thereunto, would not nevertheleſs be an argument that we ſhould diſcard it. But ſeeing the Exiſtence of ſuch a Spiritual Subſtance, cannot poſſibly be by us any other ways than *Spiritually diſcern'd*, as it is in the Language of the Scripture,

1 Cor. 2. 14. I mean by the Eye of Faith, that Manifest Reason that should incline a good Christian to teach the contrary doth not, nay cannot appear.

Axiom. 18. *Si Textus aliquis SS. Scripturae, sensibus & Rationi, aut alii Textui videatur ex opposito literaliter adversari, aliâ indiget significatione quam habet.*—

If any Text of the Holy Scripture seem directly opposite to Sense, Reason, or flatly to contradict some other Text literally, that Text want some other signification than what it has.—

The verity of this Maxim I doubt not, but is agreed and consented to by all Divines whatever, or else no right Exposition could be made of some Texts, so opposite are they in their literal Signification.

As answer a fool according to his folly, Prov. 26. 5. Answer not a fool according to his folly, Prov. 26. 4. Let every Man bear his own Burden, Gal. 6. 5. Bear ye one anothers Burden, Gal. 6. 2. This is my Body, this is my Blood, Luke 22. 19. 20. says our Saviour when he gave the Passover to his Disciples, &c. Now because these Texts either thwart, and are contradictory

dictory to each other, or to our Senses and Reason, they must necessarily require some other interpretation; this Maxim I have added, because that Text brought from, *Mat. 10. v. 38. Fear not them that can kill the Body,* &c. and several others brought as Objections, do by this Rule require other signification than what is usually attributed to them, because as that Notion of an Immaterial Substance by those Texts pretended to be prov'd, appears (as I presume) to every indifferent and unbiass'd Reader to be contrary to common receiv'd Maxims of Reason, so

Axiom. 19. *Quaecunque Doctrina Christianae Religionis principiis adversatur, aut ipsa reddit frustranea, non est a Christiano vero admittenda.*

Whatever Doctrine is contrary to the Principles of Christian Religion, or makes them void and of none effect, is not to be admitted by any true Christian.

Now one of the Principles of our Christian Religion is the owning of a *Day of general Judgment*, which this Doctrine of an *Immaterial Substance*, going immediately to *Heaven or Hell*, as soon as *Man dies*, either totally subverts, or makes void, as has been prov'd before, so evidently beyond the possibility of any satisfactory answer, that I

forbear repeating it. Because such a Notion makes God *prejudge*, and *precondemn* a Sinner without Examination, contrary to several exprefs Texts in Scripture.

Quest. Therefore whether this Opinion that so manifestly runs counter to the Exprefs word of God, and the main Principles of Christian Religion, be not an Opinion contrary to the Orthodox Faith, especially seeing another Article of our Faith, *viz.* the Doctrine of a *Resurrection* is hereby made void, and of none effect. For if, as soon as we are Born, we have in us an *Immortal Soul*, that cannot die, we by consequence *Live again*, as soon as we are Dead, which is in effect not only a *Resurrection*, but something more advantageous, in as much as our better part, our Soul, never tastes Death at all, but we go to Heaven alive, as to all intents and purposes in a purer State, as being Spiritual, and more capable of serving God who is a Spirit, than if we carried our Bodies with us. Now what need then of a *Resurrection*?

Axiom. 20. *Promissa Dei non reddi debent frustranea.*

The Promises of God ought not to be rendred void and useleſs to Mankind.——

One of thoſe principal things God Almighty has promis'd us is *Eternal Life*, and this we are to have through the Merits of Chriſt Jeſus as a *Gift of God*. But according to the Philoſophical Notion of a Man having in him an Immaterial Immortal Subſtance, this *Gift of God* is made uſeleſs to us, and his promiſe of none effect, becauſe we carry about us a Being (if the Soul be ſuch as Philoſophers define it) that has in it *Eternal Life*, (as the word Immortal implies) already, ſo that our Obligation to God for that Life is rendred void.——

This is the third Article of our Faith, viz. *Life Everlaſting*, in which we believe in our Creed, that this Doctrine of an Immaterial Subſtance, &c. ſubverts. And I am verily perſwaded, that in me it would be *Heretical* to diſbelieve theſe three Articles of Faith. Another Article is the *Mysterious Incarnation of God and Man*, which we look upon to be the *Union of a Spiritual Being to a Material One*; now this

Notion of our Soul being an Immaterial or Spiritual Substance united to our Material Body doth *convellere*, though not *subvertere* that Mystery. For if it be easily conceivable that Man may have this *Spiritual Union*, (as all my Adversaries grant, though the *Modus* be difficult) by parity of Reason it is conceivable, that God and Man may be united, though the *Modus* be difficult. Now if our Reason can comprehend a Mystery, it makes it no Mystery at all, and though the *Modus* be difficult, our Reason will substitute one for both, and consequently the Belief of this Mysterious Object of our Faith is invalidated. This is the fourth Article of our Faith, which this Notion of an Immaterial Substance united, &c. renders either void, or so perplex, that the Mysteriousness of one part of our Religion wafts.

Axiom.

Axiom. 21. Quaecunque Doctrina Deum, Omnimodo Justum, injustitiæ infimulat, Illam verus Christianus non debet amplecti.

No true Christian ought to embrace a Doctrine that accuses the most just God of injustice.——

I do not believe I have any Adversary that can contradict the verity of this *Axiom*, and I presume it sufficiently prov'd, pag. 59. *Supplement*. That it consists not with infinite Justice upon two accounts. *First*, That it charges God with inflicting Torments on the Souls of Men without an Examination of their Crime, though the *Fallen Angels*, Spirits Convict, are reserv'd to Judgment of the Great Day, and the vile wicked People of *Sodom* and *Gomorrha*, shall then find Favour, as at the determinate time, before *Corazin* and *Bethsaida* for rejecting the Gospel. *Second*, It charges God in not exercising his distributive Justice aright, according to *Axiom. 13*. For degrees of Punishment inflicted on one Man for a Crime, beyond what another suffered for the very same Crime, makes the Sentence of such a Judge unjust, all circumstances of iniquity concurring

ing equally in both, as the case is not only probable, but happens often in the World. Therefore if the *Soul* of the first Sinner, who slew his Brother, be punish'd by the Sentence of God Twenty Thousand Years (as it may so happen before the General Resurrection) before the last Sinner, who may in the same circumstances slay his Brother also, here is an apparent inequality of Justice, because the degree of Punishment by the addition of time, is more inflicted on one, than the other, tho' both equally guilty of the same Crime. This charge of injustice we seem to make on God by feigning an *Immaterial Substance* for our *Soul*, separable and self-subsisting from the Body, as soon as we die, and passing (if Wicked) into *Immediate* Torments before a General Judgment. For to say, that God, as he is supreme Lord of all Mankind, may do with us as he pleases, and therefore may without breach of Justice punish one so many Thousand Years before another Criminal, equally Guilty, is a Grand mistake: For God has promis'd, and bound himself by his Word to do right to all the Earth, and Justice is his essential Attribute, because he is not as a Man, that he should lye, or as the Son of Man, to forfeit his Word; therefore his Distributive cannot but inflict equal Torments on Sinners, equally guilty of the same

(155)

same Crimes. Now if this Opinion of the
Souls, *not being an Immaterial Substance be*
Heretical, I will conclude with the Words
of St. Paul, Acts 24. v. 14. *This I confess*
unto thee, that after the way which they call
Hereſie, ſo worſhip I the God of my Fathers.



FINIS.

Advertisement.

HAD I not seen the Name of a *Presbyter* of the *Church of England* affix'd to the Frontispiece of a Book, call'd an *Antidote against Infidelity*, and meant an Answer to *Second Thoughts*, &c. I should not have vouchsafed to have taken Notice of the two last *Enervous Champions* of a mistaken *Controversie*: The one arguing against the *Soul's Sleeping* in the Grave, and the other *Dreaming* of her flight unto the *Aerial World* for a Residence, &c. Neither of which relate to the purpose. But besides that Motive,

tive, they being Persons faithfully and credibly represented to me, labouring under so many *Wants*, as want of Bread, want of Learning, want of moral Honesty, and a true sense of Religion; by the first of which they are prompted to Write: By the second to write ill: And by the last to Write without respect to common Civility or Christianity, I presume such Authors might justly have deserv'd my Slight and Neglect. Wherefore I thought this Advertisement necessary, being not inform'd before of their true Characters, to let the World know what sort of Creatures these are, that if they should endeavour to publish for the future any more such *Efforts* in such a Style and Language as the former, mankind
might

might discover them by their
Belching, or *Braying* out Argu-
ments in their first Pages, and
the intended purchasers may be
prevented from buying Repen-
tance too dear.

*Books Printed for Richard Bassett, at the
Mitre over against Chancery-Lane-
End in Fleet-street.*

THE History of *England* faithfully Ex-
tracted from Authentick Records, Ap-
prov'd Manuscripts, and the most Celebra-
ted Histories of this Kingdom in all Langua-
ges, whether Ecclesiastical or Civil, with
the Effigies of all the Kings and Queens of
England from the *Norman* Race to the pre-
sent time, curiously Engraved on Copper
Plates from Original Medals and Pictures,
in 2 Vol. 8vo. the second Edition Corrected,
Price 12 s.

A Compleat History of *Germany*, compre-
hending the Lives and Reigns of all the Em-
perors from its Origin to this time, extra-
cted from the best Authors and private Me-
moirs, by Mr. *Savage*. To which are added,
the Effigies of all the Emperors curiously
Engraved on Copper Plates from Original
Medals, the like never extant in any Lan-
guage, in 2 Vol. 8vo. Price 12 s.

The Works of the learned and valiant *Jo-
sephus* Epitomiz'd from the Greek Original,
the History preserv'd in what is Material
and Substantial, only by contracting things
of lesser Moment, digesting the Matter clo-
ser, and avoiding useles Repetitions; to
which are added *Josephus's* two Books a-
gainst *Appion*, his Rule of Reason, or the
Mar-

Martyrdom of the *Maccabees*, and the Embassay of *Philo Judæus*, to *Caius Caligula*, the second Edition Revised, 8vo. Price 6 s.

The Miscellaneous Works of the Honourable Sir *Charles Sidley* Baronet, containing Satyrs, Epigrams, Court-Characters, Translations, Essays, and Speeches in Parliament, collected into one Vol. To which is added the Death of *Marc Antony*, a Tragedy never before Printed; published from the Original Manuscripts, by Captain *Ayllof*, 8vo. Price 4 s.

A Compleat Course of Chymistry; containing near 300 Operations, several of which have not been publish'd before; also the Structure of several Furnaces, with near 300 Characters, which are dispersed in Chymical Authors, and such Instruments and Vessels as are necessary in a compleat Laboratory, all cut in Copper, by *George Willson* Chymist, 8vo. Price 5 s.

The *English Theophrastus*; or the Manners of the Age, being the Modern Characters of the Court, the Town and the City, 8vo. Price 5 s.

The Polite Gentleman; or Reflections upon the several kinds of Wit, viz. in Conversation, Books, and Affairs of the World, translated from the *French* by Captain *Barker*. 12o. Price 1 s. 6 d.

Amusements serious and Comical, calculated for the Meridian of *London*, by Mr. *Tho. Brown*, 8vo. Price 2 s.

The Monarchs of *England*, from the Hepharchy to Her present Majesty Queen *Anne*, &c.

Em-
ula
6 s.
our
ling
ran
ent
ded
ne
Ori
8vo.

on-
of
also
ear
hy-
and
cla-
ill

ers
ers
to

ons
on-
d.
n-

u-
fr.

p-
i.





